

FEB 18 1921

VOLUME XVI

NUMBER 1

January 1921

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

*A Quarterly Journal devoted to research
in the Languages, Literatures, History,
and Life of Classical Antiquity* ♦ ♦

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, U.S.A.

*The Cambridge University Press, London; The Maruzen-Kabushiki-Kaisha, Tokyo, Osaka,
Kyoto, Fukuoka, Sendai; The Mission Book Company, Shanghai*

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

EDITORS

PAUL SHOREY, *Managing Editor*

CHARLES HENRY BRESON
ROBERT JOHNSON BONNER

CARL DARLING BUCK
GORDON JENNINGS LAING
ELMER TRUESDELL MERRILL

FRANK JUSTUS MILLER
HENRY W. PRESCOTT

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

FRANK FROST ABBOTT, *Princeton University*
WILLIAM ARTHUR HEIDEL, *Wesleyan University*
GEORGE LINCOLN HENDRICKSON, *Yale University*
FRANCIS W. KELSEY, *University of Michigan*
WALLACE M. LINDSAY, *University of St. Andrews*

SAMUEL BALL PLATNER, *Western Reserve University*
JOHN C. ROLFE, *University of Pennsylvania*
CHARLES FORSTER SMITH, *University of Wisconsin*
ANDREW FLEMING WEST, *Princeton University*
BENJAMIN IDE WHEELER, *University of California*

VOL. XVI

CONTENTS FOR JANUARY 1921

No. 1

Tà Έρρα 'Εveniμπαρav, Demosthenes xviii. 169	By Charles D. Adams	1
Land Registers of Western Asia under the Seleucids	By W. L. Westermann	12
Homer as the Poet of the Thebais	By John A. Scott	20
The Latina Colonia of Livy xl. 43	By L. R. Taylor	27
The Princes and the Senatorial Provinces	By Donald McFayden	34
Studies in Greek Noun-Formation. Dental Terminations II. 1	By Carl D. Buck	51
Greek and Latin Etymologies	By Francis A. Wood	63
Notes and Discussions		74
W. A. OLDFATHER and J. B. TITCHENER: A Note on the <i>Lexicon Militare</i> .—PAUL SHOREY: Note on the Repeated Simile, Homer <i>Iliad</i> xl. 555 and xvii. 664.—W. A. HEIDEL: Two Sophoclean Cruces.—ARTHUR STANLEY FRANK: <i>Scleratum Frigus</i> .		
Book Reviews		82
SMITH: <i>Martial, the Epigrammatist; and Other Essays</i> (Laing).—FOSTER: <i>Livy</i> (Laing).—NORDEN: <i>Die germanische Urgeschichte in Tacitus Germania</i> (Laing).—DUCKETT: <i>Hellenistic Influence on the Aeneid</i> (Prescott).—DUCCI: <i>L'Arte Classica</i> (Van Buren).—GASLIER: <i>Achilles Tatius</i> (Shurey).—LE ROUX: <i>De Richardo Bentleio atque de ratione eius critica</i> (Ullman).—VAKA and PROUTIDES: <i>Modern Greek Stories</i> (Hellema).—TAVENNER: <i>Studies in Magic from Latin Literature</i> (Laing).—PAIS: <i>Fest Triumphantis Populi Romani</i> (Frank).		
Frank Bigelow Tarbell		95

Classical Philology is published quarterly in the months of January, April, July, and October, by the University of Chicago at the University of Chicago Press, 5750 Ellis Avenue, Chicago, Illinois. The subscription price is \$4.00 per year; the price of single copies is \$1.00. Postage is prepaid by the publishers on all orders from the United States, Mexico, Cuba, Porto Rico, Panama Canal Zone, Republic of Panama, Hawaiian Islands, Philippine Islands, Guam, Samoan Islands, Shanghai. Postage is charged extra as follows: For Canada, 15 cents on annual subscriptions (total \$4.15), on single copies, 4 cents (total \$1.04); for all other countries in the Postal Union, 25 cents on annual subscriptions (total \$4.25); on single copies, 6 cents (total \$1.06). Patrons are requested to make all remittances payable to the University of Chicago Press in postal or express money orders or bank drafts.

The following are authorized to quote the prices indicated:

For the British Empire: THE CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS, Fetter Lane, London, E.C. 4, England. Yearly subscriptions, including postage, 75s. 6d. each; single copies, including postage, 6s. 9d. each.

For Japan and Korea: THE MARUZEN-KAWUSHIKI-KAISHA, 11 to 16 Nihonbashi Tori Sancho-me, Tokyo, Japan. Yearly subscriptions, including postage, Yen 8.50; single copies, including postage, Yen 2.15.

For China: THE MISSION BOOK COMPANY, 15 North Soochow Road, Shanghai. Yearly subscriptions, \$4.00; single copies, \$1.00, or their equivalents in Chinese money. Postage extra, if mailed direct outside of Shanghai, on yearly subscriptions 25 cents, on single copies 6 cents.

Claims for missing numbers should be made within the month following the regular month of publication. The publishers expect to supply missing numbers free only when losses have been sustained in transit and when the reserve stock will permit.

Business correspondence should be addressed to The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill.

Communications for the editors and manuscripts, which must be typewritten, should be addressed to the Editor of CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY, The University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

Entered as second-class matter, June 20, 1906, at the Post-office at Chicago, Ill., under the Act of July 16, 1894.

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

EDITORS

PAUL SHOREY, *Managing Editor*

CHARLES HENRY BEESON

ROBERT J. BONNER

CARL DARLING BUCK

GORDON J. LAING

ELMER TRUESDELL MERRILL

FRANK JUSTUS MILLER

HENRY W. PRESCOTT

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

FRANK FROST ABBOTT

WILLIAM GARDNER HALE

WILLIAM ARTHUR HEIDEL

GEORGE LINCOLN HENDRICKSON

FRANCIS W. KELSEY

WALLACE M. LINDSAY

WILLIAM PETERSON

SAMUEL BALL PLATNER

JOHN C. ROLFE

CHARLES FORSTER SMITH

ANDREW FLEMING WEST

BENJAMIN IDE WHEELER

VOLUME XVI

JANUARY—OCTOBER, 1921



THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

Wahr
8-28-1922
gen.

Published
January, April, July, October, 1921

Composed and Printed By
The University of Chicago Press
Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.

CONTENTS FOR VOLUME XVI

ARTICLES

	PAGE
ADAMS, CHARLES D., Τὰ Γέγρα 'Επερίμνησαν, Demosthenes xviii. 169 .	1
BOAK, A. E. R., Greek and Coptic School Tablets at the University of Michigan	189
BOLLING, GEORGE MELVILLE, Infinitives in -έμεν in Homer, Immanuel Bekker, and Professor Scott	362
BONNER, ROBERT J., The Megarian Decrees	238
BUCK, CARL D., Studies in Greek Noun-Formation. Dental Terminations II. 1	51
Dental Terminations II. 2	260
Dental Terminations II. 3	367
CRAIG, HARDIN, Dryden's Lucian	141
DEUTSCH, MONROE E., Caesar and the Ambrones (Suetonius <i>Iulius</i> ix. 3)	256
DEWITT, NORMAN W., Virgil's Copyright	338
KIRK, W. H., <i>Uti Legassit</i>	246
LAING, GORDON, The Origin of the Cult of the Lares	124
LAIRD, A. G., The Persian Army and Tribute Lists in Herodotus	305
McFAYDEN, DONALD, The Princeps and the Senatorial Provinces	34
PRESCOTT, HENRY W., Callimachus' Epigram on the Nautilus	327
ROBBINS, FRANK EGLESTON, The Tradition of Greek Arithmology	97
ROBINSON, RODNEY P., The Inventory of Niccolò Niccoli	251
SCOTT, JOHN A., Homer as the Poet of the <i>Thebais</i>	20
SHOREY, PAUL, Horace <i>Satires</i> i. 3. 112-13 and Plato <i>Theaetetus</i> 172 A, B	164
SMITH, GERTRUDE, The Prytaneum in the Athenian Amnesty Law	345
SONNENSCHN, E. A., <i>Ego</i> , Emphatic and Unemphatic, in Rises and Falls of Old Latin Dramatic Verse	231
STEELE, R. B., Ablative of the Efficient	354
STUART, DUANE REED, On Vergil <i>Eclogue</i> iv. 60-63	209
TAYLOR, L. R., The <i>Latina Colonia</i> of Livy xl. 43	27
WESTERMANN, W. L., Land Registers of Western Asia under the Seleucids	12
The "Uninundated Lands" in Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt II	169
WOOD, FRANCIS A., Greek and Latin Etymologies	63

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

	PAGE
BASSETT, SAMUEL E., On <i>Iliad</i> ii. 301 ff.	387
CALHOUN, GEORGE MILLER, Demosthenes <i>Against Boeotus</i> I (xxxix) 37-38	287
FERGUSON, A. S., On a Fragment of Gorgias	284
FRANK, TENNEY, Horace's "Swan" Song, <i>Odes</i> , ii. 20	386
HEIDEL, W. A., Two Sophoclean Cruxes	77
LOFBERG, J. O., "Unmixed Milk" Again	389
MURLEY, CLYDE, Συκοφάντης and Σύκινος	199
NUTTING, H. C., Horace, <i>Ars Poetica</i> 179 ff.	384
OLDFATHER, W. A. AND TITCHENER, J. B., A Note on the <i>Lexicon</i> <i>Militare</i>	74
PEASE, ARTHUR STANLEY, Sceleratum Frigus	81
Paralipomena	200
RITTER, C., Platon <i>Symposion</i> 212E	197
SHEWAN, A., Ποθή and Πόθος in <i>Iliad</i> and <i>Odyssey</i>	195
SHOREY, PAUL, Note on the Repeated Simile, Homer <i>Iliad</i> xi. 555 and xvii. 664	76
Τύχη in Polybius	280
WESTERMANN, W. L., Correction upon the "Land Registers under the Seleucids"	391

MISCELLANEOUS

TARBELL, FRANK BIGELOW, <i>In Memoriam</i>	95
--	----

BOOK REVIEWS

(See Index)

Classical Philology

VOLUME XVI

January 1921

NUMBER 1

TA ΓΕΡΡΑ ΕΝΕΠΙΜΗΡΑΣΑΝ, DEMOSTHENES xviii. 169

BY CHARLES D. ADAMS

Demosthenes *De Corona* 169: 'Εσπέρα μὲν γὰρ ἦν, ἦκε δ' ἀγγέλων τις ὥς τοὺς πρυτάνεις ὥς 'Ελάτεια κατεῖληπται. καὶ μετὰ ταῦθ' οἱ μὲν εὐθὺς ἐξαναστάντες μεταξὺ δειπνοῦντες τοὺς τ' ἐκ τῶν σκηνῶν τῶν κατὰ τὴν ἀγορὰν ἐξείργον καὶ τὰ γέρρ' ἐνεπίμπρασαν, οἱ δὲ τοὺς στρατηγοὺς μετεπέμποντο καὶ τὸν σαλπικτὴν ἐκάλουν· καὶ θορύβου πλήρης ἦν ἡ πόλις. "It was evening; one came to the prytanes with the news that Elateia had been seized. And then some of them instantly, arising in the midst of their supper, drove the men from the booths throughout the agora and set fire to the wicker-work, while others summoned the generals and called the trumpeter; and the city was full of tumult."

Reiske's comment is as follows:

Tabernae erant in foro sitae, in quibus sedentes opifices sellularii scruta et supellectilem domesticam a se domi fabricatam vendebant. Hae σκηναί appellabantur: die Buden. Constructae hae erant tribus e lateribus et desuper tectae cratibus vimineis, quae γέρρα appellantur. Quoniam igitur illae tabernae cum suis quaeque craticulis tam cito auferri non poterant, necesse tamen erat, ut protinus populus in foro conveniret, utpote illa nocte ibi in armis excubaturus, imperarunt prytanes, ut tabernis ignes iniicerentur, qui tabernas momento citius absumerent et laborem crates auferendi baiulis compendifacerent.

Reiske here asserts three things: first, that the γέρρα which were burned were the mats of which the traders' booths were made; second, that the purpose in burning them was to hasten the clearing

[CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY XVI, January, 1921] 1

of the agora; third, that the purpose in thus hastily clearing the agora was to make a clear space where the militia might camp that night under arms.

That the *γέφυρα* of this passage were the materials of which the *σκηναί*, the stalls or booths, were made, is the unanimous testimony of the ancient scholiasts and lexicographers, but the reason for burning them has been variously conjectured both in ancient and modern times. My first purpose in this paper is to renew Reiske's supposition, neglected by later scholars, that the purpose of the prytanes was *to secure a place for the instant assembling and encampment of the militia*. This fits all the circumstances of the case: the messenger from the north had brought the news that Philip was at Elateia; that meant the road to Thebes, and that meant Attica. By this time the people of Athens knew enough of Philip's methods to be aware that he was not the man to linger on the road. Many assumed, as we know from Demosthenes' speech of the next morning, that the Thebans were on Philip's side; when the messenger left the north, Philip was already near the northern boundary of Boeotia; any hour now his advance cavalry might be expected on the plain of Attica. Can we conceive of any other thought than this as having been the first in the minds of the prytanes when they at their supper table received the news? And would not their first concern be to call the citizens instantly to arms? Demosthenes' account fits this supposition precisely: one group of the prytanes summons the generals and the trumpeter to issue the call to arms and to muster the troops as they come in from their homes; another group of the prytanes makes haste to get the assembly place ready for them; they order the hucksters out of the booths, and these hurry away with their baskets of wares; the wicker stuff that has served as booths is piled up and burned. Perhaps there is something more of haste than is absolutely necessary, perhaps some waste of good mats, but in such excitement is it not entirely credible? But what warrant have we for the assumption that the prytanes would take it for granted that the militia would encamp in the agora that night? Schaefer thought there was none. "*Haec satis improbabilia sunt*," he says, and that seems to be the view of his successors, for they do not even mention the possibility of such an explanation. But it

seems to me that we have very clear light on the situation in another narrative, which has not, so far as I know, been used to illustrate the account given by Demosthenes. That is Andocides' account of the events of a day and night in the year 415 B.C., two generations earlier than the time of Demosthenes. The Hermae had been mutilated; the city was full of suspicion of an oligarchical plot; then all at once came the denunciation of a large group of citizens by an informer, and the alarming news that the Lacedaemonians were on the Isthmus, and the Boeotians mobilizing on the Attic frontier. Andocides describes the situation:

On the Mysteries 45: ἡ δὲ βουλὴ ἐξελθοῦσα ἐν ἀπορρήτῃ συνέλαβεν ἡμᾶς καὶ ἔδησεν ἐν τοῖς ξύλοις. ἀνακαλίσσαντες δὲ τοὺς στρατηγοὺς ἀνιπεῖν ἐκέλευσαν Ἀθηναίων τοὺς μὲν ἐν αἵσται οἰκοῦντας ἵέναι εἰς τὴν ἀγορὰν τὰ ὅπλα λαβόντας, τοὺς δ' ἐν μακρῷ τείχει εἰς τὸ Θησεῖον, τοὺς δ' ἐν Παιραιεὶ εἰς τὴν Ἱπποδαμείαν ἀγορὰν, τοὺς δὲ ἱππέας ἔτι <πρὸ> νυκτὸς σημῆναι τῇ σάλπιγγι ἡκεῖν εἰς τὸ Ἀνάκιον, τὴν δὲ βουλὴν εἰς ἀκρόπολιν ἵέναι κάκει καθεσθῆναι, τοὺς δὲ πρυτάνεις ἐν τῇ θέλῃ.

On this occasion, as on the later one, the senate (or their prytanes) call the generals and their trumpeter to issue and proclaim military orders. The hastily called militia of the city district is to use the agora as assembly place and camping-ground. As a matter of course on both occasions the agora must have been cleared of any trading-booths and other obstructions.

The interpretation of Demosthenes' account that I have revived may be criticized as assuming an unnecessary destruction of property—whether we assume the booths to have been the property of the individual shopkeepers or a part of the public property of the agora. Could not the wicker mats have been hustled out of the way? Why burn them? Doubtless that could have been done had the prytanes been less excited. But imagine the situation: the shopkeepers themselves were hurrying off with their wares, the people were pouring into the agora as the alarm spread—very soon *θορύβου πλήρης ἦν ἡ πόλις*. As the prytanes, jostled by the incoming crowds, are pulling down and piling up the mats, it is easy to imagine an excited and overzealous member picking up a brazier of coals from a shop floor and flinging them onto the pile—clearing the place once for all. The purpose was entirely rational, to make

ready the camping-place for the militia; the means used was the result of excitement, and probably that of some one individual. We must remember, too, that the Athenians had nothing but contempt for the small shopkeepers, the *κάπηλοι*; many of them were foreigners; their name was synonymous for petty trickery; if their booths, encroaching on the open space of the agora, were in the way in a time like this, we can well believe that the question of their property rights did not enter the mind of the zealous prytanes.

I turn now to an examination of other interpretations of this passage. The writer of the article *γέρρα* in Harpocration's lexicon says the wicker coverings and curtains of the booths were burned *ὑπὲρ τοῦ μὴ συνεστάναι περὶ τὰ ὦνα ἐπὶ τῆς ἀγορᾶς μηδὲ πρὸς ἄλλοις τοῖς τὰς διατριβὰς ἔχειν*, "to prevent crowds gathering about the merchandise in the agora or loitering at anything else." But that was an evening when there was no danger of loitering about the shops. Fuhr, in his revision of Blass's *Rede vom Kranze*, conjectures that the purpose was to clear a place for the people, who were beginning to stream into the agora. The explanation is too trivial; the prytanes had more important matters on their minds at that moment than providing standing-room for a curious crowd.

The favorite explanation is that the *γέρρα* were burned to give a smoke or fire signal to the country people, some say to bring in their property for protection, others say to come to a special meeting of the ecclesia the next morning (Westermann, Schaefer, Weil, Pickard-Cambridge). Goodwin, appreciating the absurdity of supposing that whenever the country people saw a smoke arising from the middle of the city they packed up and hurried into the walled town, suggests that it was understood that a fire on top of Lycabettus meant a call for a special meeting of the ecclesia on the following morning; that this afternoon therefore the prytanes seized the mats as the first material that came to hand, took them to the top of Lycabettus, and built their signal fire there. This is all mere conjecture and very improbable conjecture, for if there had been any such arrangement of Lycabettus signals for special meetings of the ecclesia, surely the proper supply of beacon material would have been kept on the spot. The whole theory of the burning of the mats as a signal, whether from the agora itself or from an eminence, is full of

absurdities, as Professor Humphreys has sufficiently shown in his critical note on this passage.

Another group of scholars have taken refuge in emendation. Instead of τὰ γέρρα Ἐνεπίμπρασαν they write τὰ γέρρα ἄνεπεράνυσαν (Paul Girard, *Revue de Philologie*, XI, 25-32; Blass, *Rede vom Kranze*, Anhang I; Butcher and Humphreys approve, though printing Ἐνεπίμπρασαν in their texts). It should be noted at once that the MS authority for Ἐνεπίμπρασαν is unanimous, and that it includes a papyrus fragment of about the year 200 A.D. The lexicographers and scholiasts also testify without exception to this reading. The proposed reading rests on a different interpretation of τὰ γέρρα; these are assumed to be wicker hurdles regularly used to bar the entrance to certain of the streets coming into the agora. Demosthenes' statement is then interpreted as meaning that the prytanes "stretched the hurdles," i.e., closed these streets. And we are told that this was done as one of the regular preliminaries to a meeting of the ecclesia. We are to understand then that as preparatory to the meeting of the next morning on the Pnyx, the prytanes late in the afternoon before, when the news came to them, closed trade in the agora by driving the shopmen from their booths, barred the streets that did not lead from the agora to the Pnyx, and summoned the generals, with the trumpeter, to issue and proclaim the order for a special meeting of the ecclesia for the next morning.¹

Now this account is not without its own difficulties. It assumes that the predominant thought of the prytanes when they heard that an attack by Philip was imminent was, not how to put the city into an instant state of defense, but how to get a full meeting of the ecclesia tomorrow morning. And it assumes that the measures which were sometimes taken to force the idle and reluctant crowd to leave their loafing-place in the agora and go up to the Pnyx were felt to be so necessary on this occasion that the prytanes themselves did the work, and did it fully twelve hours before there was any possible reason for having it done. And then why drive the shopmen out tonight? All that will be needed will be to forbid them

¹ There is no reason to suppose that the prytanes lacked authority to call a special meeting of the ecclesia themselves. See Aristotle *Resp. Ath.* 43. 3. It is doubtful whether the generals could do it except through the prytanes.

to open their shops tomorrow morning. And finally—the great absurdity of all—who can believe that as the crowds began to pour into the agora that evening as the news spread through the city, it was found practicable to bar the majority of the agora entrances with hurdles? If this barring with the hurdles were something that was done early on the morning of the ecclesia, it would not be entirely unthinkable, though it would be quite needless on an occasion when the people were so eager for advice and action. But to imagine it as taking place in the afternoon, or early in the evening, of the previous day, I find quite impossible.

Now an examination of the passages which suggested this emendation will show that the emendation rests upon a false interpretation of those passages themselves, and that the use of γέρρα at any time to bar the streets leading out of the agora is pure conjecture.

The emendation goes back to the words τὰ γέρρα ἀνεπετάννυσαν in the scholion on Aristophanes' *Acharnians* v. 22. Dicaeopolis says, as he sits on the Pnyx in the early morning, impatient at the delay of his fellow-citizens in coming to ecclesia, "Here is the Pnyx empty; and they are gossiping in the agora, and running up and down dodging the painted rope." The scholiast explains that in order to compel the citizens to attend the ecclesia, two policemen were accustomed to drive the crowd before a painted rope dragged across the agora. He gives in detail the steps preliminary to this dragging of the rope from one side of the agora to the other: he says, ἀνεπετάννυσαν γὰρ τὰ γέρρα καὶ ἀπέκλειον τὰς ὁδοὺς τὰς μὴ φερούσας εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ τὰ ὦνια ἀνῆρουν ἐν ταῖς ἀγοραῖς ὅπως μὴ περὶ ταῦτα διατρίβοιεν. Omitting for the moment the first clause, we read that they closed those streets which did not lead to the ecclesia, and they removed the goods which were on sale in the agora. Imagine the situation: the streets not leading toward the Pnyx are barred, and the shopkeepers have gone off with their goods; what else needs to be done before the rope can be drawn across the agora to force out the loitering voters? Manifestly the booths must come down; the rope cannot be drawn across while they are still standing; and so we turn to the first detail of the scholiast's account, ἀνεπετάννυσαν τὰ γέρρα, "they spread out the wicker work"; precisely what was needed. With the sides and tops of the booths *spread flat on the ground* there

was nothing to hinder drawing the rope across the agora; there was no need of lugging the mats away. I am interpreting τὰ γέρρα precisely as in the *Crown Speech*; and I take ἀνεπετάννυσαν in its ordinary meaning, "they opened up, they spread out." The word is oftenest used of the opening of doors or gates: Xen. *Anab.* vii. 1. 17, ἀνεπετάννυσαν τὰς πύλας "they threw open the gates"; Herod. 3. 146, ἀναπετάσας τὰς πύλας "having thrown open the gates"; so Pindar *Nem.* 9. 2; *Olymp.* 6.27; Isoc. 15. 126. Plato *Republic* 514a, the cave has its entrance ἀναπεπταμένην πρὸς τὸ φῶς "open to the light"; in Xenophon *Oecon.* 9. 4 the house with a southern exposure πρὸς μεσημβρίαν ἀναπέπταται; in Plutarch *Pericles* 34 the life in the open is called διαίτα ἀναπεπταμένη; the scholiast on the *Speech against Neaera* (§ 90) uses ἀναπετασθῆναι of the opening of the assembly place (πρὶν ἀναπετασθῆναι τὴν ἐκκλησίαν παντὶ τῷ εἰπεῖν βουλομένῳ). In Pindar *Isth.* 4. 47 the fox awaits the swoop of the eagle ἀναπιτναμένα, flattened out. I conclude then that the scholiast on *Acharnians* 22 means to tell us that the first step preparatory to sweeping the agora with the dripping rope was to open up and spread flat on the ground the booths of the tradesmen; after this certain streets were barred; meanwhile the tradesmen had hustled their wares out of the way; only the loitering citizens remained, and they were swept out of the agora before the painted rope.¹

Those who seek in this passage a clue to the passage in the *Crown Speech* interpret very differently. They assume that the words τὰ γέρρα ἀνεπετάννυσαν in the scholion give the means by which

¹ For this discussion it does not matter whether or not the scholiast was right in his understanding of what was done with the painted rope. He certainly supposed that it was drawn across the agora to force out the voters and drive them toward the Pnyx, and his words ἀνεπετάννυσαν τὰ γέρρα must be interpreted on that supposition. Compare Aristophanes *Ecclesiaz.* 378 f. and the scholion: καὶ δῆτα πολὺν ἢ μάλισ, ὃ Ζεὺ φίλτατε, γέλων παρέσχε, ἣν προσέριπνον κύκλω. Schol., κατὰ γὰρ τὴν ἀγορὰν ἐσθῶν ἐκτὸς ἐκκλησίαν τοὺς Ἀθηναίους μεμλτωμένους σχοινίῳ. We have the same view in Pollux viii. 104: τοὺς μὴ ἐκκλησιάζοντας ἐξημίου, καὶ τοὺς ἐκκλησιάζοντας ἐξήταζον, καὶ σχοινίον μιλτώσαντες διὰ τῶν τοξοτῶν συνήλανον τοὺς ἐκ τῆς ἀγορᾶς εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν.

A different view of the custom at which Aristophanes hints is elaborated by L. Schmidt, *Antiquitatum Graecarum capp. duo*, pp. 9 ff. It is summarized, with approval, in Schoemann-Lipsius (*Griech. Allerthümer*, I, 407) in these words: "Der Versammlungsplatz wurde durch mit Mennig gefärbte Seile abgesperrt und ein gleiches geschah mit dem in der Nähe der Pnyx gelegenen Marktplatz, der sonst den Mittelpunkt des Verkehrs bildete."

the action of the next clause, the barring of the streets, was effected: *ἀνεπετάννυσαν τὰ γέρρα καὶ ἀπέκλειον τὰς ὁδοὺς* "they spread the wicker hurdles and (thereby) closed the streets." Assuming for the moment that *τὰ γέρρα* may mean hurdles, and that they were regularly used for barricading these streets, it is certainly surprising to find the scholiast using this verb *ἀνεπετάννυσαν* for the erection of the hurdles, for, as we have just seen, its ordinary meaning is to open up gates and doors, not to close them. Of course the proper word for barricading is *φράσσω* or one of its compounds, as in Philochorus *Frag.* 79b (the description of preparations for the ballot on ostracism) *ἐφράσσετο σάνισιν ἡ ἀγορά, καὶ κατελείποντο εἰσοδοὶ δέκα* "the agora was barred off with planks, and ten entrances were left." So far as etymology goes one might use *ἀνεπετάννυσαν* of "stretching out" a hurdle across a street, but I find no instance of a similar use of the word; its common use in the sense of "open up" makes such use very unlikely. Moreover this interpretation of the Aristophanes scholion involves the assumption that here the *γέρρα* are hurdles, regularly used to bar streets. But have we any authority for such use of the word? Harpocration connects the *γέρρα* with the market booths only, either as coverings, sides, or *περιφράγματα* (meaning probably partitions separating one from another or dividing the space into passageways). He also says *καὶ οἱ τόποι οἱ παραπεφραγμένοι*, meaning, I suppose, the place of the booths as a whole. The *Etymologicum Magnum* has similar definitions. The attempt has been made to find the meaning "barricades" (wicker-hurdles) in the *Speech against Neaera*, § 90. The speaker is describing in detail the steps that must be taken in order to confer Athenian citizenship on a foreigner. He tells us that after it has been voted by the people, the gift must be confirmed at the next ecclesia by a secret ballot, in which, to give validity to the vote, 6,000 citizens must participate. He does not tell us where this secret balloting takes place, whether on the Pnyx or in the agora. The words in question are as follows: *τοὺς δὲ πρυτάνεις κελεύει τιθέναι τοὺς καθίσκους ὁ νόμος καὶ τὴν ψῆφον διδόναι προσιόντι τῷ δήμῳ, πρὶν τοὺς ξένους εἰσιέναι, καὶ τὰ γέρρα ἀναιρεῖν, ἵνα κύριος ὢν αὐτοῦ ἕκαστος σκοπῇται πρὸς αὐτὸν ὄντινα μέλλει πολίτην ποιήσεσθαι, εἰ δέξιός ἐστι τῆς δωρεῆς ὁ μέλλων λήψεσθαι* "the law commands the prytanes to set out the ballot boxes and give

the vote to the people as they come up, before the foreigners come in, and to carry off the γέρρα, in order that each man, in full control of himself, may consider by himself what sort of man he is about to make a citizen, whether he is worthy of the gift that he is about to receive." The main point is clear: no foreigners are to have access to the voters while the balloting is in progress. Our question now turns on the words τὴν ψῆφον δίδουσι προσιόντι τῷ δήμῳ πρὶν τοὺς ξένους εἰσέρχαι καὶ τὰ γέρρα ἀναιρεῖν. Some scholars assume that the γέρρα here referred to are hurdles used at meetings of the ecclesia on the Pnyx to bar out foreigners, when matters are being handled that demand their exclusion. As Blass punctuates, . . . τῷ δήμῳ, πρὶν τοὺς ξένους εἰσέρχαι καὶ τὰ γέρρα ἀναιρεῖν, we have to understand that after this special balloting is over, the foreigners will come in and remove the barriers. I need not dwell on the difficulty of assuming that the foreigners are allowed themselves to remove the barriers, or on the apparent implication that the foreigners first come in, and then proceed to remove the barriers that have been keeping them out. The punctuation is simply impossible; ἀναιρεῖν must be made co-ordinate with τιθέναι and δίδουσι; the law directs the officials to conduct the balloting before the foreigners come in, and it directs the officials ἀναιρεῖν τὰ γέρρα. But we have no warrant for the assumption that foreigners were allowed to mingle with the voters in the Athenian ecclesia; the board of ληξιαρχοὶ and their assistants were appointed expressly to prevent this (Poll. 8. 104, Gilbert, *Staatsalterthümer*, p. 322). Whatever may be the meaning of the words τὰ γέρρα ἀναιρεῖν, they certainly cannot mean the removal of barriers so that foreigners could take seats with the Athenian citizens in ecclesia. In fact it is impossible to find any meaning for the phrase as applied to anything that could happen on the Pnyx after the people were assembled there.¹

But if we assume—what Gilbert and Busolt think probable—that the ballot which was taken to confirm a grant of citizenship was taken in the same place as the ballot for ostracism, *in the agora*,

¹ The explanation in Harpocration, s.v., γέρρα, is impossible: πρὶν εἰσέρχαι τοὺς ξένους καὶ πρὶν ἀναιρεθῆναι τὰ περιφράγματα, τούτῳ πρὶν ἀναπετασθῆναι τὴν ἐκκλησίαν παντὶ τῷ εἰσεῖν βουλομένῳ.

and with the same machinery, all difficulties disappear. Philochorus (*Frag.* 79b) thus describes the process in the case of ostracism: ἐφράσσετο σάνισιν ἢ ἀγορὰ καὶ κατελείποντο εἰσοδοὶ δέκα, δι' ὧν εἰσιόντες κατὰ φυλὰς ἐτίθεσαν τὰ ὄστρακα. "The agora was fenced off with boards, and ten entrances were left, through which they entered by tribes and cast their ballots." Plutarch (*Arist.* 7) describes the place of the balloting a little more precisely: ὄστρακον λαβὼν ἕκαστος καὶ γράψας ὃν ἐβούλετο μεταστήσαι τῶν πολιτῶν ἔφερον εἰς ἓνα τόπον τῆς ἀγορᾶς περιπεφραγμένον ἐν κύκλῳ δρυφάκτοις, "each man taking a potsherd, and writing the name of that one of the citizens whom he wished to remove, brought it to one place of the agora, which place was fenced off on all sides by railings." This inclosure, then, with its ten entrances where the members of the several tribes could be checked off by the supervisors, was erected inside the agora. Now if the same method was used in the case of the balloting by six thousand citizens for confirmation of citizenship—and the similarity of conditions makes it likely that it was used—the specifications of the law as given in the Neaera speech become at once intelligible and consistent. That law requires the prytanes to set out the ballot boxes (τιθέναι τοὺς καδίσκους) and give opportunity to vote to the people as they come up (τὴν ψῆφον διδόναι προσιόντι τῷ δήμῳ). Of course the voters will come up to the boxes in the central balloting inclosure through the ten entrances. But that they may not, as they come into the free part of the agora on their way to the voting inclosure, be importuned and influenced by foreigners who would ordinarily be there, in and about the tradesmen's booths, the law provides that this ballot take place before the foreigners come into the agora at all (πρὶν τοὺς ξένους εἰσιέναι) and, both to assist in keeping them out and to make room for the extraordinary gathering of the citizens and the special balloting-inclosure, the law directs the prytanes to remove the traders' booths altogether (ἀνελεῖν τὰ γέρρα). That the booths, if allowed to remain standing, would naturally involve the presence of the foreigners is evident when we remember that retail trade in Athens was very largely in their hands; hence the article, τοὺς ξένους.¹

¹ On foreigners in the agora shops see Boeckh, *Staatshaushaltung*, I, 404.

Thus in each of the three much-discussed passages that we have considered we have found that the simple and natural interpretation is that the γέρρα are the booth mats. In the Aristophanes scholion we learn that when the two policemen were about to drag the red rope across the agora, they flattened out these booth mats (ἀνεπεράνυσαν τὰ γέρρα). When the prytanes were preparing the agora for the balloting by six thousand citizens, they were directed by the law to carry off the booth mats (τὰ γέρρα ἀναρπῆν). And when, in 339 B.C., the prytanes, expecting any hour to hear that Philip was across the border, were calling the citizens to encamp in the agora under arms as their grandfathers had done in Andocides' day, they drove the shopkeepers from their booths, tore down the mats, and set fire to them (τὰ γέρρα ἔνεπίμψαν).

The emendation ἀνεπεράνυσαν in Demosthenes *De Corona* 169 rests on misinterpretation of the Aristophanes scholia. Emendation is unnecessary, if we accept Reiske's natural explanation of events, viewed in the light of the similar events of an earlier time, recorded by Andocides.

DARTMOUTH COLLEGE

LAND REGISTERS OF WESTERN ASIA UNDER THE SELEUCIDS

BY W. L. WESTERMANN

Beginning with the publication in the Tebtunis papyri¹ of fragments of the land surveys made in the Fayum in Egypt, we have obtained a detailed knowledge of the meticulous methods followed by the village scribes in the villages of Egypt in keeping up the land lists in their village districts. Annually they corrected the land lists, with notations of the changes among the tenants. In their reports the land was classified under administrative categories, as royal domain, land under grant, or temple land. The village scribes also reported the land under its "production categories," stating what amount of each holding was entirely flooded (*βεβρεγμένη*), how much unflooded but subject to irrigation by ditching (*ἄβροχος*), and how much was dry (*χέρσος*).² On the basis of the information thus obtained and the local land register thus annually corrected and brought up to date, the land taxes and the rentals from the royal domains were calculated and collected.

The village scribes formulated their reports and sent them upward annually through the regular bureaucratic channels to the royal scribe of the nome. In his office these reports by villages were formulated into a land register for each nome.³ Ulrich Wilcken has assumed that a land register of the whole of Egypt was also kept in the central offices of the Ptolemies at Alexandria.⁴ No positive proof of the existence of this general register has so far been found. But the assumption is no doubt correct; and I venture to add that it would necessarily be greatly curtailed, in the matter of detailed

¹ Bernard P. Grenfell, Arthur S. Hunt, and J. Gilbert Smyly, *The Tebtunis Papyri* (P. Teb.) (London, 1902), see Appendix I, pp. 538 ff.

² W. L. Westermann, "The 'Uninundated Lands' in Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt," in *Classical Philology*, XV (1920), April number.

³ H. Lewald, *Beiträge zur Kenntnis des römisch-ägyptischen Grundbuchrechts* (Leipzig, 1909), p. 82, n. 6.

⁴ Ulrich Wilcken, *Grundzüge und Chrestomathie der Papyruskunde* (Leipzig, 1912), I 1, p. 178.

information, in comparison with the registers of the nomes, and that the nome registers would necessarily be abstracts of the highly detailed registers by villages kept in the offices of the village scribes.

From Egypt we have so far relatively little information from the bureaux of the nomes as compared with the mass of documents from the village bureaux. From the great central bureau of the diocetes at Alexandria we have nothing. For the land problem in Western Asia in the period of the Macedonian dynasties the situation is quite reversed. No lists are available of the peasants and their little holdings, no village registers. There are extant, however, a few inscriptions dealing with large grants of land made by the Seleucid kings, that is, by the central government, through its general registry office for the kingdom of Syria. These permit a tentative reconstruction, in general outline, of the system of land registers of the royal domain of the Seleucids. This reconstruction is necessarily subject to change as further information comes to light.

In the year 254-253 B.C. Antiochus II sold to his queen Laodice a stretch of the royal domain in the Troad, designated as the village of Pannus.¹ The transaction was carried through as follows: King Antiochus wrote to the satrap of the Hellespontine satrapy, Metrophanes, bidding him determine the boundaries, or more exactly, make the legal "description of property,"² mark off the property with boundary stones, and arrange for the publication of the sale. The satrap in this transaction was the regular avenue of communication between the king and the lower officials. Metrophanes, the satrap, transmitted the order to Nicomachus, the overseer of the royal domains of the Hellespontine satrapy.³ Nicomachus sent the order downward to one — crates the hyparch, who is the man who actually carried on the operations of determining the boundaries and marking with terminal stones the territory sold.⁴

¹ Dittenberger, *Orientalis Graeci Inscriptiones*, 225; B. Haussoullier, *Revue de Philologie*, XXV (1901), 8-21.

² *O.G.I.* 225, l. 30, *περιορῶσαι*. That this is the official term for "description of the boundaries of the property" rather than for the actual determination by boundary stones on the spot is shown by the following words: *σηλώσαι τὴν χώραν καὶ προσαναγράψαι τὸν περιορισμὸν εἰς τὰς στήλας*. Cf. Haussoullier, *Rev. de Phil.*, XXV, 32. In *O.G.I.* 221, l. 24; 225, l. 14, and 229, l. 10, the verb *προσπορίζειν* develops the further meaning of "describing the boundaries and assigning the land to" some city.

³ *O.G.I.* 225, ll. 37-38.

⁴ *Ibid.*, ll. 35-36, 49-50.

Of the four documents which formed the original correspondence upon this sale, the two upper ones, the order of Nicomachus and the letter of Metrophanes to Nicomachus, have been lost. There still remain the greater part of the king's letter¹ and the attestation of —crates, the hyparch, that the matter had been attended to.² It is best to begin with the most detailed of the registers, which would necessarily be the local register of the hyparch. The order which came to this official was to fix the limits of a unit of the royal domain called "the village of Pannus and the localities falling within its territory."³ In the original discussion, between Antiochus and his queen, of the transference to Laodice, the tract is so designated, with additional mention of a place called "Baris and the countryside dependent upon it."⁴ The town of Baris, situated upon the right bank of the river Aesopus, evidently developed into a more important place in the later history of the Troad, so that it is mentioned by several of the Byzantine writers.⁵

When the hyparch —crates came to look up the definite description of this village of Pannus upon the local register he found the following delimitation: "Upon the east, starting from the territory of Zelea which looks toward the territory of Cyzicus (the boundary is) the royal road, the old one, leading to the village of Pannus and passing above the village and Baris; from this road⁶ along past the altar of Zeus, which is above Baris, and past where the tomb lies on the right of the road; from the tomb,⁷ the royal road itself (is the boundary) which crosses the Eupanese, as far as the river Aesopus."⁸ The southern boundary, formed by the river, was apparently not mentioned in the description, as being self-evident. In setting up the boundary stones of the estate the hyparch, or more probably his agents, found that the old royal road, which had once marked the eastern line of this unit of the royal domain, had been plowed under

¹ *O.G.I.* 225, ll. 1-33.

³ *Ibid.*, ll. 2-4.

² *Ibid.*, ll. 34-50.

⁴ *Ibid.*, l. 21.

⁵ Haussoullier, *op. cit.*, 37-38.

⁶ The description now changes from the eastern to the northern boundary, or that leading from the eastern to the western line.

⁷ Again the direction changes, now to the western line.

⁸ *O.G.I.* 225, ll. 40-43, 46-49.

by those living about the place. Three villagers of Pannus were therefore called upon to point out where the road had formerly run. Their names are given in the hyparch's delimitation, evidently to legalize the transaction in case of dispute. No doubt the eastern boundary thus re-established was fixed by boundary stelae, though this is not stated by the hyparch.¹ Presumably there was no plot of the royal domain in this locality, since it would have been referred to in determining the eastern boundary line had such a plot existed in the local land registry office.

An analogous description of boundaries has been preserved in the case of a long-continued boundary dispute between the Cretan towns of Itanus and Hierapytna.² Several descriptions of the boundaries³ of the city-state territory of Itanus, as fixed in previous decisions in this case, were introduced as evidence before the arbitration board of citizens of Magnesia in 139 B.C.⁴ The most complete of these reads as follows: "It was decided by the people of Itanus and Praesia to make peace for all time on the basis of the territory which each now holds, the boundaries of which are these: As the Sedamus flows to Karymae, to the ridge of the hill and beyond to the crest, and straight along following the crest, thence in a straight direction to Dorthannae to the pond, and as the road runs, southward of the road leading through Atron, thence to Mallus in a straight line to the sea."⁵ A map was also introduced in evidence upon which it was "clear at a glance" that the temple of Zeus lay outside the disputed territory.⁶

The Aristodicides document⁷ consists of three letters of Antiochus I Soter (281-261 B.C.) to the satrap of the Hellespontine satrapy, named Meleager, headed by a covering letter of Meleager to the people of Ilium. The king sent an order to the satrap, stating that

¹ *Ibid.*, ll. 43-45.

² W. Dittenberger, *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum* (2d ed., Leipzig, 1900), No. 929.

³ In this case called *περιορισμός*, *ibid.*, l. 57.

⁴ *Ibid.*, n. 7.

⁵ *Ibid.*, l. 62 ff.

⁶ *Ibid.*, l. 71, *καθότι καὶ διὰ τῶν ἐπιδεικνυμένων ἡμῖν χωρογραφίων εὐδύσποτον ἦν.*

⁷ *O.G.I.* 221.

he had given, in full ownership,¹ a large estate in the Troad to Aristodicides of Assos. He commands the satrap to arrange that 2,000 plethra of land bordering upon the towns of Gergitha or Scepsis be assigned to Aristodicides and that it be "bounded off and assigned" to the territory of the Ilians or Scepsians.² Again it is apparent that the *προσορισμός*, the detailed description of the boundaries, is available neither at the central land registry of the king nor at the satrapal registry of Meleager. The actual work of delimitation must be referred to the local registry.

Meager though it is, the evidence shows that the local registry offices of the royal domain could produce written descriptions of boundaries (*προσορισμοί*) of the areal units by villages, and the city-state registration bureaus equally detailed descriptions of their territories. The Mnesimachus document found in 1910 at Sardes by Buckler and Robinson and published by them with an excellent commentary,³ shows that the successors of Alexander were giving out large and small portions of the old Persian royal domain in Asia Minor under heritable leases, either to soldiers or in return for other types of distinguished services. The villages and allotments granted to Mnesimachus paid a fixed rental in money into the financial chest of the subdivisions of the satrapy in which each lay.⁴ In the time of the Mnesimachus document, fixed by the editors in the period 306-301 B.C.,⁵ these subdivisions were called chiliarchies.⁶ The grant to Mnesimachus fixes for us a land classification in the Seleucid kingdom which must have corresponded to the gift land (*γῆ ἐν δωρεᾷ*) of the land under grant (*γῆ ἐν ἀφέσει*) in Ptolemaic Egypt.⁷ The payment of rental by Mnesimachus, and later by the temple organization which took over the land from him, proves that the title to the land still rested with the king.

¹ O.G.I. 221, l. 20, *δεδώκαμεν* as opposed to *ἐπικεχωρήκαμεν*, "we have granted to." Cf. *δοῦναι*, l. 27, and see Haussoullier, *op. cit.*, 31, n. 2.

² *Ibid.*, ll. 21-25.

³ In the *American Journal of Archaeology*, XVI (1912), 11-82.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 55.

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 22-23.

⁶ The editors of the document (p. 69) suggest that these chiliarchies may be the same satrapal subdivisions later known as hyparchies.

⁷ Wilcken, *Papyruskunde*, I 1, p. 284.

The land granted to Mnesimachus, though regarded by him as a single estate¹ and mortgaged in its entirety, consisted of non-contiguous areas. The grant was made under two types of areal units, by villages,² and by much smaller units called "allotments" (κλήροι).³ The view of the editors of the Mnesimachus document that the villages granted to him were "probably not laid off by metes and bounds"⁴ is certainly incorrect. Just as in the case of the village of Pannus sold to Laodice,⁵ the boundaries of each of the village units granted to Mnesimachus must have been sought out in the local registry and the actual local transfer of the land to Mnesimachus made with the greatest exactness as to boundary details. Without such provision the local land registry would have been in a continual state of confusion and a clear title to the property impossible to maintain.

The central land register of the royal domain of the Seleucid kings was constructed necessarily upon broader lines, with an apparent absence of details of the delimitation of the properties. The units on the royal, or central, register were villages⁶ and allotments, κλήροι.⁷ The allotments were presumably of definite areas⁸ at the outset of the Seleucid régime, as was probably the case also under the early Ptolemies in Egypt.⁹ But in Egypt the size of the cleruch grants, even in the late second century B.C., had become quite variable in the same locality and the actual areas of the holdings of

¹ *AJA*, p. 12, col. I, ll. 2, 4, οἶκον.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 12-13, κῶμαι αἶδε (αι) καλοῦνται τοβαλμουρα καὶ ἄλλαι κῶμαι ἢ καλεῖται τάνδου καὶ κομβδιλιπια καὶ ἄλλη κῶμη Περιασσοστρατα καὶ ἄλλη κῶμη ἐν Ἀττοῦδδοις ἢ καλεῖται Ἰλου κῶμη.

³ *Ibid.*, ll. 6, 8.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 54.

⁵ *O.G.I.* 225, ll. 40-49.

⁶ *AJA*, XVI, 12-13. τοβαλμουρα κῶμη κῶμαι τανδου καὶ κομβδιλιπια καὶ ἄλλη κῶμη Περιασσοστρατα; *O.G.I.* p. 225, l. 2, Πάννου κῶμη; *O.G.I.* 221, ll. 28-29, τὴν Πέτραν καὶ τῆς χώρας τῆς Πετρίδος ἐργασίμου πλέθρα χίλια πεντακόσια; *O.G.I.* 262, l. 6, κῶμην τὴν Βαιτοκαικηνήν, granted by one of the kings named Antiochus to the temple of Zeus Baetocaeece.

⁷ Mnesimachus document, *AJA*, XCI, 12-13. The κλήροι about Smyrna granted to certain mercenaries colonized in Palaemagnesia are of two types, ordinary allotments and "cavalry" allotments, κλήρους ἱππικῶς in *O.G.I.* 221, ll. 42-43.

⁸ *AJA*, XVI, 74.

⁹ P. Teb. I, Appendix I, p. 548.

the "hundred arourae" and the "thirty arourae" cleruchs fail in many cases to agree with the titles.¹ So also in Western Asia, variation in the size of the allotments, as private ownership developed, must have come rapidly. In 125-26 A.D. Hadrian wrote to the proconsul of Asia stating that he should take as a standard of measurement for the *kleroi* a mean between the largest and the smallest holdings in that vicinity, if it was impossible to find out the size of the allotments as established by the kings (the Seleucids).²

The indications that the central land registry of the Seleucids was without detailed descriptions of its village and allotment units and unable to keep up to date its information upon transfers from the royal domain are as follows:

1. The king, in all the available cases, must order the satrap to have the delimiting done locally.³

2. In the case of the sale to Laodice the central register is unable to indicate what *τόποι* (perhaps meaning single plots upon which peasants are living outside the village) are on the estate called "the village of Pannus."⁴

3. The village of Petra, conferred upon Aristodicides of Assos, had already been granted to one Athenaeus and the grant had not, as yet, been recorded at the central registry.⁵

The central register did, however, show, in the case of the village of Baetocaece, that it had once been held by an official named Demetrius, but was again available for assignment.⁶ For the royal domains about Babylon the local, or detailed, register would, of

¹ P. Teb. I, Appendix I, p. 547. Cf. P. Teb. I, 27, ll. 7-8; 30, l. 17 (34 arourae); 31, l. 13 (34½ arourae); 32, note to line 18 (24 arourae); 54 (10 arourae).

² The ingenious attempt of the editors of the Mnesimachus document (*AJA*, XVI, 73-75) to determine the actual size of the allotments granted to Mnesimachus leads to no acceptable result. The computation is based upon three factors, none of which is applicable with certainty to the situation about Sardes in the time of Mnesimachus. These are a 4 per cent return on land values (this must have been quite variable); an unconvincing comparison between the size of plots of city land about Magnesia with the *kleroi* about Sardes; and an unproved assumption that these city plots of Magnesia were approximately of the same productive quality as the allotments granted to Mnesimachus.

³ *O.G.I.* 225, l. 30; 221, ll. 21-23; 262, l. 8, "according to the existing boundaries."

⁴ *Ibid.*, 225, ll. 3-4.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 221, ll. 50-54.

⁶ *O.G.I.* 262, ll. 6-7.

course, be in Babylon itself and immediately available to the officials of the king. This explains why, in a grant made to his wife Laodice by Seleucus II¹ in 233-232 B.C.,² the size of the grants (15, 12, 30 measures) is recorded.³

There was a land register maintained for the Lydian satrapy at Sardes, at a bureau called the βασιλικαὶ γραφαί.⁴ This may have been the name of the land-registry office or of a general record office of the satrapy, of which the land registry was merely one department. In the sale to Laodice the satrap Metrophanes receives an order from the king to record the sale in this Sardian bureau. It is a justified assumption that similar land registers for the satrapies were established in the other provinces of the Seleucid kingdom.

There is no evidence regarding the extent of the details kept upon the satrapal registers. I have shown, however, that the actual descriptions of the boundaries were obtained through the hyparch, an official of the subdivision of the satrapy.⁵ One has, therefore, a strong impression that the satrapal registry office was not supplied with details as to the land units of villages and allotments.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY
ITHACA, N.Y.

¹ Haussoullier, *op. cit.*, 18. The cuneiform tablet recording this gift is in New York.

² Rostovtseff in *Klio* I, 299, n. 1.

³ *Rev. de Phil.*, XXV, 18.

⁴ *O.G.I.* 225, ll. 23-24, καὶ τὴν ὥνην ἀναγράψαι εἰς τὰς βασιλικὰς γραφὰς τὰς ἐν Σάρδεσσιν.

⁵ *O.G.I.* 238, n. 2. See the fuller discussion by Haussoullier, *op. cit.*, 22-26.

HOMER AS THE POET OF THE *THEBAIS*

By JOHN A. SCOTT

No argument advanced against the Homeric authorship of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* seems more convincing than the assumed fact that at an early date Homer was regarded as the source of all the earliest epics, the *Thebais*, the *Epigonoï*, the *Cypria*, and the rest, as well as of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. This idea is most sweepingly stated by Verrall and by Wilamowitz; Verrall in the *Quarterly Review* for July, 1908: "Homer was a nebulous mass of old poetry reduced into distinct bodies, such as the *Iliad*, *Odyssey*, *Cypria*, *Aethiopis*, and so on, for educational purposes by learned Athenians between 600 and 500 B.C." Wilamowitz, *H.U.*, 353: "Um 500 sind alle gedichte von Homer." The first reference to Homer is supposed to be to him as the author of the *Thebais*, *H.U.*, 351:¹ "Das älteste Homercitat, von dem wir wissen, ist das des Kallinos, das wir oben bei Pausanias angetroffen haben: es gieng die *Thebais* an." The same author in his *Die Ilias und Homer*, p. 365: "Wenden wir uns nun zu Homer, so nennt ihn unser ältester Zeuge, Kallinos, um 600 Verfasser nicht der *Ilias*, sondern der *Thebais*, aber er nennt den Namen des Dichters." To a similar conclusion the remark by Finsler points in his *Homer*, I, 63: "Im 7. Jahrhundert schreibt der Dichter Kallinos von Ephesos dem Homer die *Thebais* zu." Even so conservative a work as *Christ-Schmid* says without explanatory note or comment (p. 95): "Nach Pausanias ix. 9. 5 hat der Elegiker Kallinos die *Thebais* als homerisch anerkannt." There is not the slightest indication that in Pausanias the person quoted is Calaeus and not Callinus, that no manuscript has the name of the elegiac poet, and that Callinus is purely a conjectural reading. We have no other quotation from Callinus which shows him as a composer of anything but martial hymns, so that the conjecture is at best very doubtful; yet it is the sole support for the theory that Homer was regarded in the seventh century as the poet of the *Thebais*.

¹ *H.U.* = *Homerische Untersuchungen*.

In discussing the story of "Thebes," Pausanias says that these things have been put in verse by Antimachus Ἀντίμαχος ἐπιστρατεῖαν Ἀργείων ποιήσας ἐς Θήβας, viii. 254. This *Thebais* of Antimachus was very popular and often quoted, so that Kinkel is able to print fifty-six fragments therefrom, while he is able to find but seven from what is regarded as the earlier *Thebais*, and most of these are doubtful, since the fragment quoted by Athenaeus is assigned to that earlier postulated poem on the basis of the phrase ὡς ὁ τὴν κυκλικὴν Θηβαίδα πεποιηκὼς φησιν (Athen. xi. 465 E.) There is no reason for not assigning this quotation to Antimachus, since he too was regarded as a cyclic poet. Horace refers to him as *scriptor cyclicus* in *Ars Poet.* 142, and had him in mind as the one who went back to Meleager when telling of the return of Diomedes, as we know from Porphyry's note to this passage in Horace, *Antimachus fuit cyclicus poeta*. There can be no doubt that cyclic poets were authors of cyclic poetry, so that the *Thebais* of Antimachus was regarded as cyclic poetry long before either Pausanias or Athenaeus.

The scholiast to *Stat. Theb.* iii. 466 says of this *Thebais*: *Dicunt poetam ista omnia ex Graeco poeta, Antimacho, deduxisse, qui et ipse longam Thebaidem scripsit et veteribus in magno pretio habitam*. Judging from the frequency with which the *Thebais* of Antimachus is quoted and the high regard in which it was held, it seems safe to say that this would be the *Thebais* to which Pausanias referred, if there is no contrary evidence; but instead we do have positive evidence that it was the version of Antimachus he was following, for he begins the discussion with the words above quoted, "It was Antimachus who put in verse the story of the expedition against Thebes."

I do not care to discuss all uses of the word *Thebais* in Pausanias, but they all occur in parts of his writings which are subsequent to the statement that he is relying on the poetical version of Antimachus.

Nothing is more remarkable than the different ways in which Wilamowitz looks at the same thing, when this thing can be made to serve his different theories, since in discrediting Homer the slightest inference drawn from Pausanias becomes a foundation of granite capable of supporting the most far-reaching theories, but when he wishes to prove that all of the oldest poetry, except the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, were lost at an early period, then the most explicit

statements of Pausanias become utterly worthless. *H.U.*, 338: "*Paus.* iv. 2 und sonst werden epische citate mit einem unzweideutigen ἐγὼ ἐπελεξάμην eingeführt. Es wird ohne zweifel vielen ganz lästerlich klingen, wenn ich auch nur die frage aufwerfe ob Pausanias die gedichte gelesen hat. Dennoch scheue ich mich nicht, mit zuversicht und mit ruhe diese frage zu verneinen. Die belesensten männer, Plutarch und Porphyrius, haben die gedichte nie gesehen." Here he is discussing the early epic poems of the Homeric cycle. It seems to me further discussion of this passage is hardly necessary, for if the most explicit statements are to be thrown aside as worthless, it is hard to put much weight on a doubtful reference, and that a reference which depends on a most improbable conjecture. It is unlikely that Callinus ever wrote any literary discussion, so that even if all the manuscripts had the name Callinus, it would then be necessary to prove that the Callinus intended was the poet of Ephesus.

The sole argument against the form Calaeus is that no man of that name is known, but at least one-half of all the proper names given by Pape are names occurring but a single time.

The theory that Pausanias was here quoting the elegiac poet, Callinus, needs some support for itself and cannot alone and unaided furnish the proof that in the seventh century B.C. Homer was generally regarded as the poet of the *Thebais*. Pausanias may in the very passage quoted be expressing his surprise that a Calaeus should assign a poem by Antimachus to Homer, just as I might be surprised that a prominent writer in a recent magazine assigned *She Stoops to Conquer* to Sheridan, or that Secretary Lane confused Achilles and Antaeus, or that many educated people think the Bible is the source of the phrase, "The Lord tempers the weather to the shorn lamb."

The meaning of Pausanias is not clear; the word Callinus is a conjecture, and Wilamowitz accuses Pausanias, *H.U.*, 340: "er hat sich eine gelehrsamkeit angeschwindelt die er nicht besass," so that if a clear statement is set aside, we feel that an obscure passage founded on an emendation is poor support for arguments which discredit the literary judgment of the entire ancient world, for that ancient world chose to neglect the *Thebais*.

The second writer quoted to prove that Homer was regarded as the author of the *Thebais* is Herodotus from whom the following passage is confidently quoted (v. 67): Κλεισθένης γάρ, Ἀργείοισι πολεμήσας τοῦτο μὲν ῥαψωδοῖς ἔπαισε ἐν Σικυῶνι ἀγωνίζεσθαι τῶν Ὀμηρίων ἐπέων ἐννεκα, ὅτι Ἀργεῖοί τε καὶ Ἄργος τὰ πολλὰ πάντα ὑμνέεται. Finsler in his *Homer*, I, 64, never doubts that here is a clear reference to the *Thebais*, for he says: "Die *Thebais* ist gemeint, wenn der Tyrann Kleisthenes von Sikyon die Rhapsodenvorträge verbietet, weil die homerischen Gedichte Argos zu sehr verherrlichten." Wilamowitz, *H.U.*, 352: "Es ist nur sinn wenn der dichter der *Thebais* verstanden wird." It is waste of time to quote this same sentiment from the many writers who argue that there is no praise of Argos and the Argives found in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* which would arouse the envy of a hostile neighbor, and since Argos is so neglected in these poems some other poem must be assumed that contains the needed praise, hence the hypothetical praise in an assumed *Thebais*. However, the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* do seem to furnish ample justification for the phrase Ἀργεῖοί τε καὶ Ἄργος τὰ πολλὰ πάντα ὑμνέεται, since some form of the word Argos is found in every book of the *Iliad* but one, and even in the *Odyssey*, where Ithaca and the Ithacans turn our attention away from Argos and the Argives, some form of this word is found in fifteen of the twenty-four books, hence thirty-eight Homeric books mention Argos or the Argives. Rawlinson, with no thought of this discussion, in his note to the first chapter of *Herodotus* says: "The ancient superiority of Argos is indicated by the position of Agamemnon at the time of the Trojan War and by the use of Argive in Homer for Greek generally. No other name of a single people is used in the same generic way." Here this competent historian bases the claim for Argive superiority entirely on the campaign before Troy, that is, on the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*.

However, this is not a question of probabilities, for we know from the Argives themselves the poetry which stirred their pride, since we have a copy of the very inscription they set up in honor of Homer. This inscription is added to the *Contest between Homer and Hesiod* as published in the works of Hesiod. The present form of this *Agon* is admittedly late, as it contains the name of the Emperor

Hadrian, but E. Rhode, *Rh. Mus.*, XXXVII, 566; E. Meyer, *Hermes*, XXVII, 378; and Wilamowitz, *Die Ilias und Homer*, pp. 400 f., agree in assigning the material of the *Agon* to a date earlier than the Age of Pericles. The date of the Argive inscription is uncertain, but even Wilamowitz who discusses this *Agon* in his *Ilias* under the heading *Ein Altes Volksbuch* declines to give it a later date than the fourth century B.C. The account of the inscription and the inscription itself are as follows: "The leaders of Argos rejoicing greatly in the fact that their own people have been so highly honored by the most illustrious of poets have in turn loaded him with conspicuous honors. They erected a bronze image and voted him a sacrifice for each day, each month, each year, and in addition every fifth year sent an offering for his glory to Chios. On his image they engraved the following verses:

θεῖος Ὅμηρος ὃδ' ἐστίν, ὃς Ἑλλάδα τὴν μέγαν αὖχον
 πᾶσαν ἐκόσμησεν καλλιπέει σοφίῃ
 ἔξοχα δ' Ἀργείους, αἱ τὴν θεοτειχέα Τροίην
 ἤρηνσαν ποινὴν ἠνικόμου Ἑλένης
 οὐ χάριν ἐστῆσεν δῆμος μεγαλόπτολις αὐτὸν
 ἐνθάδε καὶ τιμαῖς ἀμφέπει ἀθανάτων.

This is divine Homer, who adorned all proud Hellas with his wonderful poetic skill, but most of all he honored the Argives, who humbled the god-built city Troy, as a requital for the wrongs done to the fair-haired Helen, and hence the proud-citied state worships him now with divine honors.

Here we have from the Argives themselves the thing in Homer which they viewed with such boundless pride, and this thing was no exploit connected with Thebes, but it was the expedition against Troy, that is, they felt exalted because Homer had honored them in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, and they never mentioned in this inscription anything in regard to Thebes.

There can be no doubt that hostile neighbors would envy them just the thing in which they themselves took this unbounded pride, and that thing is found in no assumed *Thebais*, but in Homer, our Homer, the Homer who wrote the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*.

In no place in *Herodotus* do the Argives lay any claim to honor or favor because of their connection with Thebes, but oddly enough the Athenians at the battle of Plataea claimed as one of the reasons

for commanding the wing opposite the Spartans their own services at that time; *Her.* ix. 27: "When the Argives led their troops with Polynices against Thebes and were slain and refused burial, it is our boast that we went out against the Cadmaeans, recovered the bodies and buried them at Eleusis in our own territory." Yet in the face of this, these lynx-eyed critics assume that there was nothing in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* to stir the pride of the Argives or to arouse the envy of jealous neighbors, hence they must flee to a poem which told how these same Argives could not bury their own slain but depended on the mercies of a foreign race to bury them in a foreign soil.

The love the people of Argos had for Homer is shown by the fact that Aristarchus quoted readings from the Argive state manuscript for both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, but there is not the slightest evidence that they made any attempt to preserve any copy of the *Thebais*.

In the *Panegyricus*, 158, Isocrates tells of the sadness the Greeks always feel when told in poetry of the wars between the Greeks, and then he adds: "I think that the poetry of Homer has received the greater glory because he pictures them as fighting the barbarians, and it was just because of this that our ancestors honored him in musical festivals and in the education of the young." If Isocrates could pick out as the especial merit of Homer that he represented the Greeks as fighting the barbarians and not one another, then there is no doubt that Homer was not regarded as the poet of the *Thebais* in Athens in the fourth century B.C., and if Isocrates had ever heard of such a tradition he could not have used this argument. This speech was no sudden and careless production, but a work of art in the preparation of which the orator had spent many years, so that it must be regarded as evidence of the greatest weight.

These two passages, one from *Herodotus*, the other from *Pausanias*, are the only assumed allusions in any classical Greek writer to a *Thebais* by Homer, yet on this slender foundation Wilamowitz has erected all his stupendous theory of Homer's name and fame in connection with the *Thebais*. Many sentences like the following could be quoted from his recent *Die Ilias und Homer* (p. 375): "The testimony of Callinus proves that in his age the rhapsodists in

Ephesus recited the *Thebais* as Homeric, perhaps these very reciters called themselves Homeridae. Homer is only in a restricted sense the poet of the *Iliad*." In all of this book the author gives the impression that the only solid fact in connection with Homer is that he was the poet of the *Thebais*, yet everything rests on a wrong interpretation of a passage in *Herodotus*, an interpretation refuted by an inscription set up by the Argives themselves, and on a passage in *Pausanias* where all the manuscripts have Calaeus, and where Pausanias himself said that Antimachus had put in verse the story of the expedition against Thebes, 'Αντίμαχος ἐπιστρατέων Ἀργείων ποιήσας ἐς Θήβας.

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

THE LATINA COLONIA OF LIVY xl. 43

By L. R. TAYLOR

The identity of the Latin colony mentioned by Livy under the year 180 B.C. has occasioned much discussion (xl. 43. 1):

Pisanis agrum pollicentibus quo Latina colonia deduceretur gratiae ab senatu actae. Triumviri creati ad eam rem Q. Fabius Buteo M. et P. Popilii Laenates.

This statement must be considered in relation to several other passages. The establishment of a citizen colony at Luna in 177 B.C. is recorded by Livy (xli. 13. 4-5):

Et Lunam¹ colonia eodem anno duo milia civium Romanorum sunt deducta. Triumviri deduxerunt P. Aelius <M. Aemilius> Lepidus Cn. Sicinius; quinquagena et singula iugera et semisses agri in singulos dati sunt. De Liguribus is captus ager erat; Etruscorum antequam Ligurum fuerat.

In the same year according to Velleius a colony—whether of citizens or of allies he as usual fails to designate—was established at Luca (i. 15. 2):

Aquileia et Gravisca et post quadriennium Luca.

In 168 B.C. Livy mentions a dispute over boundary lines between Luna and Pisae (xlv. 13. 10-11):

Disceptatum inter Pisanos Lunensesque legatos <est> Pisanis querentibus agro se a colonis Romanis pelli, Lunensibus adfirmantibus eum de quo agatur ab triumviris agrum sibi adsignatum esse. Senatus qui de finibus cognoscerent statuerentque quinqueviros misit Q. Fabium Buteonem P. Cornelium Blasioem T. Sempronium Muscam, L. Naevium Balbum C. Apuleium Saturninum.

Scholars who have preferred to accept the traditional text have identified the *Latina colonia* with Luca, explaining the slight discrepancy between Livy and Velleius as to the date of the colony by the fact that Livy records not its final establishment, but the

¹ Lunam is unquestionably the proper emendation of the reading *una* of the manuscripts.

senate's original provision for it.¹ But others have followed Mommsen² in referring all these passages to the colony of Luna.³ In order to do this they have been forced to accept two emendations, the comparatively simple one of Luca to Luna in Velleius i. 15. 3, and the much more radical change of Latina to Luna in Livy xl. 43. 1.³ Against this interpretation may be urged not only the necessity of the two emendations which it entails but the fact that this is the only case where the *triumviri* who finally established a colony were not identical with the ones originally appointed for the purpose.⁴ In its favor is the fact that the appointment in 168 of Quintus Fabius Buteo as commissioner to settle the dispute between Luna and Pisae is particularly fitting since he was probably identical with the *triumvir* of the same name who made the original provisions for the colony in 180. Moreover—and this argument has had the greatest weight—from the foundation of Ariminum in 268 only twelve Latin colonies are generally believed to have been established in Italy, and Luca, or this Latin colony, whatever its identity, would make the thirteenth.

This theory of the twelve Latin colonies is one of the many interpretations of Mommsen which are quoted without due regard for the sources on which they are based. The only occurrence of the expression *duodecim coloniae* is in a passage of Cicero's *Pro Caecina* which refers to Sulla's punishment of the Volaterrani for their resistance to him (§102):

Iubet enim <sc. Sulla Volaterranos> eodem iure esse quo fuerint Ariminenses; quos quis ignorat duodecim coloniarum fuisse et a civibus Romanis hereditates capere potuisse.

Mommsen noted that exclusive of the *Latina colonia* of Livy xl. 43 there were only twelve additional Latin colonies founded in Italy

¹ Cf. Bormann, *CIL*, XI, 295; Nissen, *Italische Landeskunde*, II, 1, 287; Solari, *Topografia Storica dell'Etruria*, III (1915), 25 ff.; Pais, *Ricerche sulla Storia e sul Diritto Romano*, I (1918), 696 ff. Pais and Solari would also emend Lunenses to Lucenses in Livy xlv. 13. 10.

² Cf. Mommsen, *CIL*, I, 147-48. See also Kornemann, *s.v.*, *coloniae*, Pauly-Wissowa, p. 516; Ruggiero, *Diz. Epig.*, *s.v.*, *coloniae*, p. 453.

³ This reading is given without italics in the text of Weissenborn's commentary (1875), but Müller's revision, 1909, restores *Latina*.

⁴ Cf. the accounts of the establishment of the five citizen colonies in 194, Livy xxxii. 29; xxxiv. 45, and of Vibo Valentia and Copia, Livy xxxiv. 53; xxxv. 9 and 40.

beginning with the establishment of Ariminum in 268.¹ These, he believed, were the *duodecim coloniae* of Cicero; they were founded, he thought, under a less favorable constitution than the earlier Latin colonies. Yet the only respect in which these later colonies can actually be proved to have been inferior to the earlier ones is in that they had not the right to coin silver.² But that is a fact of no significance, for shortly after the opening of the Roman mint in 268, the very year Ariminum was established, that right was taken away even from the Latin colonies and allied cities that had previously exercised it. The issues of bronze coins made by several of these later Latin colonies after they were colonized show that there was no disposition to apply severe regulations with regard to coinage.³ Cicero's reference to the *duodecim coloniae* does not therefore provide sufficient justification to emend Livy xl. 43. 1.⁴

If then there is no good reason to doubt that a Latin colony was founded in 180 the question of its location must be considered. The possibility that it was established not at Luca but at Pisae itself has not, at least in recent discussions, received serious attention. Yet if Velleius had not mentioned the existence of a colony at Luca no one would have doubted that the colony for which the Pisans offered

¹ Mommsen, *History of Rome*, II, 52. Cf. *Staatsrecht*, III, 624; *Münzwesen*, pp. 317 ff.

² Mommsen's later view expressed in his article, "Die Stadtrechte von Salpensa und Malaca," *Ges. Schriften*, I, 295 f., was that the inhabitants of these twelve colonies were the *Latini coloniarii* mentioned by juristic writers. He believed that the rights accorded these later Latin colonies served as a prototype for the Latin rights subsequently granted even under the Empire (e.g., in the charters of Salpensa and Malaca). Yet he is not prepared to state the extent of these rights and the inferiority of the later colonies to the earlier ones with the definiteness of Marquardt (*Staatsverwaltung*, I, 53), Kornemann (s.v., *coloniae*, Pauly-Wissowa, p. 518), and Girard (*Droit romain*, [1911], p. 109). Particularly Mommsen questions the inference which is drawn from Ulpian (v. 4) that these later communities differed from the earlier ones in lacking the right of *connubium*. The inadequate justification which the sources provide for these conclusions has recently been pointed out by Steinwenter, s.v., *ius Latii*, Pauly-Wissowa, X, 1, 1267-68.

³ Such issues were made by Ariminum, Beneventum, Firmum, and Brundisium.

⁴ The twelve Latin colonies were probably an alphabetical list of unknown content, headed by Ariminum. Beloch, *Italischer Bund*, pp. 155 ff., thought that they were identical with the twelve colonies which rebelled in 209 against the levies of money and soldiers made by Rome during the Hannibalic War (Livy xxvii. 9), and were accordingly punished in 204 (Livy xxix. 15). Since Ariminum was not in this list he emends Ariminenses of Cicero, *Pro Caecina*, §102, to Ardeates. The sanest view of the evidence is that of Steinwenter, *loc. cit.*

land was to be at Pisae. Otherwise Livy would naturally have stated where the colony was to be placed. If it was at Pisae it is easier to understand the later boundary dispute between Pisae and Luna, the difficulties of which have caused several scholars to emend Lunenses to Lucenses in Livy xlv. 13.¹ Pisae's offer of land for colonists followed immediately upon the deportation to Samnium of 47,000 Ligures Apuani who dwelt in the mountains near the coast and along the river Macra.² Their removal doubtless made available a part of Pisae's *ager* that had previously been subject to constant raids from this tribe.³ It also provided the territory for the citizen colony that was established with unusually large land grants three years later in *ager* which Livy said had been captured from the Ligurians but had formerly belonged to the Etruscans. What more natural than a later disagreement between the Pisani and the Lunenses as to the extent of the territory that was restored to Pisae in 180? The appointment, on the commission to settle the dispute, of one of the *triumviri* who had established the Latin colony in Pisae's *ager* is noteworthy. The considerable distance between Pisae and Luna which has caused some critics to believe that the dispute took place with Luca is no reason for emending Lunenses to Lucenses in Livy xlv. 13.⁴ The close relationship between Luna and Pisae is evident from a reference to Luna in an inscription under the name Luna Pisa,⁵ as well as from the fact that when Pisae received citizenship it was enrolled not in the Fabia ward with Luca but in the Galeria to which Luna and the other Ligurian cities belonged.

¹ Cf. Beloch, *op. cit.*, pp. 147-48; Solari and Pais, *loc. cit.* Against this emendation it may be urged that if the colony referred to was Luca one would expect Livy to speak of *coloni Latini*, not *coloni Romani*.

² Livy xl. 38 and 41.

³ Cf. Livy xxxix. 32; xl. 1.

⁴ From Strabo's description of the region (v. 2. 5, a passage with some textual difficulties) it would seem that the territory of Luna and Pisae joined and that Luca's *ager* did not extend to the sea. But Pliny's mention (*H.N.* iii. 51) of *colonia Luca a mari recedens* among the maritime cities of Etruria suggests a different view. Perhaps there was an extension of the city's *ager* when it was colonized by the triumvirs or by Octavian.

⁵ Cf. *CIL*, XIII, 1968 (Lugdunum) . . . qui sepellitus est L[u]nae Pisae in Tusci[a] ad flumen Macra.

A consideration of the history of Luca and Pisae makes it still more probable that the colony was located at Pisae.¹ Before 180 Luca is mentioned only in Livy xxi. 59 as the place to which Sempronius withdrew in 218 after his defeat by Hannibal near Placentia. The reliability of this statement has been questioned on the ground of military probability and of consistency with Livy's later narrative.² Luca is not once mentioned in the accounts of the long Ligurian wars either before or after the Latin colony of 180 was founded. It is likewise unknown in epigraphical and literary sources until the year 56 B.C., when, as the southernmost city of Caesar's province, it served as the meeting place of Pompey and Caesar in the famous conference of Luca.³ If it was the site of the Latin colony it must from Livy's statement have been a dependency of Pisae with little or no territory of its own. The accessibility of the site which later made Luca an important road-center could hardly have offset the disadvantages of its undefended position in the plain protected only by the river Auser from the Ligurian tribes on the north who were by no means thoroughly pacified in 180. Yet although they continued to make attacks on Luca and Pisae⁴ there is no record of any raid on Luca's territory.

Pisae on the other hand was a logical site for a colony. The tradition which is but slightly supported by archaeological evidence indicates that it was originally in Ligurian territory⁵ and was later

¹ The subsequent status of Luca and Pisae gives no help in determining which was the Latin colony. Both were later *municipia*, a status acquired by all Latin colonies after the Social War, and both were colonized by the triumvirs or by Augustus. Cf. evidence given by Bormann, *CIL*, XI, 273, 295.

² Cf. Weissenborn's note *ad loc.* See De Sanctis' recent discussion of Livy's sources in this passage (*Storia dei Romani*, III [1917], 2, 99-102), where, however, the trustworthiness of the reference to Luca is defended.

³ Cf., however, Festus, p. 155, Lindsay, where in a list of allied cities and Latin colonies that became *municipia* after the Social War the form *Lucrenses* of the MSS has been emended both to *Lucenses* (so Lindsay and Beloch, *op. cit.*, p. 148) and to *Locrenses* (Mommson, *Staatsrecht*, III, 236, note). The latter emendation is altogether possible since Locri was a *civitas foederata*.

⁴ Livy xli. 19.

⁵ Justin xx. 1, 11; Pseudo-Aristotle, *De mirab. ausc.* 92. There may be some truth in the tradition that Pisae was originally a Greek settlement. Cf. Pais, *Ancient Italy* (translated by C. D. Curtis, 1908), pp. 355-65.

conquered by the Etruscans who, however, seem not always to have been successful in holding it against the constant incursions of the Ligurians.¹ It first appears in history in 225 as a port that had contact with the west² and as such it is mentioned a number of times in the Hannibalic War.³ Already it must have been an ally of Rome. During the Ligurian wars in the first decades of the second century B.C. it was Rome's military and naval base against the Ligurians.⁴ The *provincia Pisae* or *Ligures*⁵ on the west coast and the *provincia Ariminum* or *Gallia* on the east were the two fields of operation assigned to the chief magistrates in Italy at this time. Both Pisae and Ariminum were then beyond the confines of Italy proper which seem not to have been extended to include them until the time of Sulla.⁶ Only great confidence in an ally can explain why Rome had not previously planted a colony at a frontier port of the importance of Pisae as she had colonized Ariminum long before. But she waited until in 180 the Pisans themselves requested a colony and offered for the purpose land that had become available because of recent Roman victories and the consequent deportation of the Ligures Apuani. The Pisans must have desired colonists to increase their population and to lighten their individual burdens in safeguarding against further Ligurian incursions. In their stipulation that the colony should be Latin, a type of community that would not essentially change Pisae's status as an ally, there is a further indication that the offer for which the senate passed a vote of thanks provided for a colony not merely within Pisae's *ager* but at Pisae itself, the city that continued to be Rome's base against

¹ Lycophron 1241; Servius on *Aeneid* x. 179. Cf. Bormann's summary of evidence, *CIL*, XI, 273.

² Polybius ii. 27. 1.

³ Polybius iii. 41. 2 and 4; iii. 56. 5; iii. 96. 9; Livy xxi. 39.

⁴ Livy xxxiii. 43; xxxiv. 56; xxxv. 3, 4, 6, 21; xxxviii. 35; xxxix. 32; xl. 1, 17, 19, 26, 41; xli. 5, 12, 14, 15, 17, 19; xlii. 9; xliii. 9; xlv. 16, 17.

⁵ Livy xxix. 32; xli. 5; xlv. 16, 17. Cf. xli. 14, 15 where *Pisae* and *Ligures* are two separate provinces.

⁶ The old boundary line seems to be marked by the station *ad Fines* on the Tabula Peutingeriana. Cf. Bormann, *CIL*, XI, 273; Nissen, *op. cit.*, I, 71; II, i, 300.

the Ligurians.¹ In this period of active colonization² the senate must gladly have granted the request of the Pisans, the only instance recorded in which a city petitioned for a colony. Numerous colonies had been established as bulwarks against the Gauls, but as yet there were none to guard against the Ligurians who were proving fully as great a source of trouble. The planting of a citizen colony at Luna three years later indicates that the senate had come to a still fuller realization of the needs of the situation.

We have seen that there is no good reason to question Livy's record of a Latin colony in 180. In favor of placing this colony at Luca rather than at Pisae there is only Velleius' reference to an otherwise unknown colony at Luca. But his assignment of that colony to 177, the very date attested by Livy for Luna's colony, points to the strong probability that Luca has here crept into the text instead of the original reading Luna, to the colonization of which Velleius makes no other reference.

VASSAR COLLEGE

¹ Cf. references to Livy xli. and following cited above. Up to the end of Livy's narrative in 167, Pisae is still the chief naval and military base of the region although Luna is also mentioned several times. The military importance of both cities probably ended with the triumph over the Ligures Apuani celebrated in 155 by M. Claudius Marcellus to whom a column and a statue were erected in the Forum of Luna. Cf. *CIL*, I, 623 (=I, 539).

² In the first two decades of the third century fourteen citizen and four Latin colonies were founded in Italy. Between 184 and 180 citizen colonies were established at Potentia in Picenum, Pisaurum in Umbria, Mutina and Parma in Aemilia, and Saturnia and Graviscae in Etruria. In the same period a Latin colony was established at Aquileia in Cisalpine Gaul. The only colonies founded later than 180 were the citizen colonies of Luna (177) and Auximum (157). Cf. Kornemann's lists, *s.v.*, *coloniae*, Pauly-Wissowa, pp. 514 ff.

THE PRINCEPS AND THE SENATORIAL PROVINCES

By DONALD MCFAYDEN

Had the princeps under the Augustan constitution an *imperium maius* over the senatorial or "public provinces"? Modern historians almost without exception state that he had,¹ basing their statement on certain passages in Cassius Dio and Ulpian. Dio tells us that in 23 B.C., after Augustus had surrendered the consulship, the senate ἐν τῷ ὑπηκόῳ τὸ πλεῖον τῶν ἐκασταχόθι ἀρχόντων ἐπέτρεψεν;² and elsewhere he tells us that the emperor ἐντολὰς τέ τινας καὶ τοῖς ἐπιτρόποις (procuratoribus) καὶ τοῖς ἀνθυπάτοις (proconsulibus), τοῖς τε ἀντιστρατήγοις (legatis pro praetore) δίδωσιν, ὅπως ἐπὶ ῥητοῖς ἐξίωσι, and adds that this was already the custom under Augustus.³ He further tells us that the proconsuls chose their legati subject to the princeps' approval.⁴ These statements of Dio are apparently borne out by the remark of Ulpian that the proconsul *maius imperium in ea provincia habet omnibus post principem*.⁵ It is argued that the story which Dio tells is entirely credible; that the later years

¹ E.g., Arnold, *Studies in Roman Imperialism*, pp. 27, 38; Boak, "The Extraordinary Commands from 80 to 48 B.C.," *American Historical Review*, XXIV (1918-19), 1-25; Bouché-Leclercq, *Manuel des institutions romaines*, p. 149; Bury, *Student's Roman Empire*, pp. 13, 28, 32, 38; Ferrero, *Greatness and Decline of Rome* (Eng. trans.), IV, 243; Gardthausen, *Augustus*, I, 528, 565, 729; Heitland, *Roman Republic*, III, 429; Hertzberg, *Geschichte des römischen Kaiserreichs*, pp. 13 f., 76; Herzog, *Geschichte und System der römischen Staatsverfassung*, pp. 137 f.; Kromayer, *Die rechtliche Begründung des Prinzipats*, pp. 49 f.; Mommsen, *Römisches Staatsrecht*, II³, 659-61; Pelham, *Essays in Roman History*, p. 71; Schiller, *Geschichte der römischen Kaiserzeit*, I, 153; Schultz, *Das Wesen des römischen Kaiserthums der ersten zwei Jahrhunderte*, pp. 26-28; *Vom Prinzipat zum Dominat*, p. 12; Shuckburgh, *Augustus*, pp. 148, 158; Willems, *Le droit public romain*⁷, p. 418. Greenidge (*Roman Public Life*, p. 386), however, after citing the passages in Dio and Ulpian on which the ordinary view is based, cautiously remarks: "It is a passive rather than an active *maius imperium* that is here contemplated. The whole scheme of the provincial dyarchy rested on the assumption that there should be no relation between the proconsul and the princeps. . . . The statement that (the princeps) possessed *maius imperium* over (the senatorial) governors can only mean that in any collision of authority the princeps is not inferior to the proconsul."

² lili. 32. 5.

³ lili. 15. 4.

⁴ lili. 14. 7.

⁵ Ulpian *apud Dig.* I. xvi. 8.

of the Republic furnished abundant precedents¹ for a decree such as Dio describes, and that grants of extraordinary proconsular powers were not infrequently made in favor of others than the princeps throughout the first century of the Empire,² at least one of which conferred upon the grantee a *maius imperium* over senatorial as well as over imperial provinces.³ It is particularly insisted that unless such a decree had been passed, Augustus' surrender of the consulship would have cost him all hold upon the senatorial provinces.

Neither evidence nor a priori argument, however, is as weighty as at first appears.

As to the evidence, it is to be remembered that both Dio and Ulpian wrote under the Severi, when the Augustan principate was on the wane. By both of them the Empire is regarded as an absolute monarchy. Ulpian as praetorian prefect was a natural champion of the imperial prerogative; while Dio has been convicted in more than one instance of misunderstanding or possibly inventing senatorial decrees of the time of Julius Caesar or Augustus in his search for the origin of the privileges and powers possessed by the emperor in his own day.⁴

¹These precedents may be found conveniently collected and discussed in the article by Boak cited in note 1.

²Mommsen, *Staatsrecht*, II³, 1151 ff.

³Tacitus *Ann.* ii. 43. 2.

⁴Thus: (1) In Dio's day the emperors exercised legislative powers through the device of issuing edicts or rescripts which gained permanent validity through the senate's oath to the emperor's *acta*. Dio sees in the legislation of Augustus in 19 B.C. the first instance of this practice and says that the practice was authorized at that time by senatorial decree (liv. 10. 6). The fact is that the *Leges Juliae* passed by Augustus in that and succeeding years were passed by him in the comitia by virtue of his tribunician powers (*Mon. Anc.*, chap. vi [Greek]), and that the custom for which Dio is seeking to account was a later growth. (2) The emperor in Dio's day was *legibus solutus*. Dio traces this privilege to a decree of the senate passed on the occasion of Augustus' return from Spain in 24 B.C. (liii. 28. 2). As Gardthausen (*Augustus*, I, p. 723) has pointed out, all that the senate did on that occasion was to grant Augustus a special dispensation from a single law. (3) The senatorial decree to which Dio traces the employment of the *praenomen imperatoris* by the emperors (xliii. 44. 2-5; cf. lii. 40. 2, 41. 3-4) is almost certainly apocryphal (McFayden, *History of the Title Imperator under the Roman Empire*, University of Chicago Press, 1920). (4) Dio says that Augustus was twice invested with the *cura morum* (liv. 10. 5, 30. 1), whereas we know from Augustus himself that that prerogative, though thrice offered, was never accepted (Mommsen, *Res gestae Divi Augusti*, 28-30). (5) Dio asserts that Augustus in 19 B.C. was granted the *consularis potestas* (liv. 10. 5), a statement which Mommsen (*Res gestae Divi Augusti*, 27; *Staatsrecht*, II³, p. 872, n. 2) has rightly branded as a fiction. (6) Dio traces the right of the emperor to accept *appellationes* to a decree of the senate of the year 30 B.C. (li. 19. 7). The present writer hopes to show in a later paper that this right was a later extra-constitutional development.

The argument that but for the supposed decree Augustus would have lost control of the senatorial provinces by his surrender of the consulship derives its force from an erroneous conception of the nature of the principate. The princeps' power was neither created nor was it limited by law. Primarily, according to the Augustan theory, the princeps was the god-sent and god-endowed "chief citizen" of Rome. As such he was assigned all manner of difficult tasks, the administration of the unsettled and frontier provinces, for example. But his influence was not confined to those spheres of the administration which were legally assigned to him. It was paramount everywhere. Even within the city itself the magistrates were always ready to carry out his instructions, while the senate took no important step without consulting him. Hence no law was needed to insure Augustus' supremacy over the senatorial provinces. The subservience of the senate would of itself secure him full control; the proconsuls were quite ready to listen to his suggestions; while the provincials never were disposed to take seriously, indeed they seem never to have clearly understood, the legal limits of the princeps' authority. They insisted on regarding him as an absolute autocrat.¹ On the other hand, the acceptance by Augustus of a universal and permanent *maius imperium* in the senatorial provinces would have been ill advised. Had the princeps possessed permanent proconsular authority over the senatorial provinces, it is hard to see how the formal division of the provinces between the senate and the princeps would long have survived. The senate would then have had a legal right to call upon the princeps to take over the administration of these provinces in every emergency, and the provincials would have had an indefeasible right of appeal to him. These rights would have been only too eagerly grasped. Inevitably the emperor would have found himself becoming more and more the actual administrator of the "public" as well as of the Caesarian provinces, and the provincial dyarchy would rapidly have disappeared.

The rejection of the story in Dio is made easier by the fact that it is not difficult to surmise its origin. It is altogether probable that Augustus was granted about this time a *maius imperium* over Sicily

¹ McFayden, *History of the Title Emperor under the Roman Empire*, pp. 47-52.

and the senatorial provinces of the east. In 22 B.C. Augustus set out on his second eastern tour. On this tour he made many readjustments in various senatorial provinces, the legality of which it is hard to understand unless he was possessed of proconsular authority over them.¹ The probability is that Dio, as his manner was, misinterpreted this temporary grant of a *maius imperium* over certain provinces as a permanent grant covering all the "public" provinces.

The passages which we have thus far cited do not, of course, exhaust our information regarding the relation of the princeps to the senatorial provinces. When we turn to examine such other evidence as we possess, we note in the first place that Dio and Ulpian are the only two ancient authorities which attribute to the princeps a legal *imperium* over the senatorial provinces. There is no mention of any such prerogative of the princeps in the accounts given us by Strabo² or Suetonius³ of Augustus' reorganization of the Empire, nor is there any reference to it in the *Monumentum Ancyranum*. Indeed the statement of Augustus,

potestatis autem nihilo amplius habui quam qui fuerunt mihi quoque in magistratu conlegae,⁴

would seem positively to exclude it, for in law the senatorial proconsuls were Augustus' colleagues. Tacitus seems to know nothing of it, otherwise it is hard to see how he could have represented Nero as promising:

teneret antiqua munera senatus, consulum tribunalibus Italia et publicae provinciae adsisterent; illi patrum aditum praeberent, se mandatis exercitibus consulturum.⁵

In fact all our sources, including Dio himself in other places,⁶ stress Augustus' surrender of the peaceful provinces to the senate in a manner which is difficult to understand if he retained legal rights over them.

When we examine the concrete instances of the princeps' intervention in the affairs of the senatorial provinces recorded in our

¹ The material on this tour of Augustus may be found assembled in Gardthausen, *Augustus*, I, 806-33, and the corresponding portions of Vol. II.

² xvii. 3. 25.

³ *Aug.* 47.

⁴ Chap. 34.

⁵ *Ann.* xiii. 4. 3. Other instances of Tacitus' ignorance are cited below.

⁶ E.g., liii. 4. 3, 12. 1; lvi. 40. 2; lvii. 2. 4, etc.

sources, we find much that is hard to explain if we accept Dio's statement that he possessed an *imperium* over them, and little that cannot be satisfactorily explained if we reject it. In general our sources represent the "public" provinces as subject in law only to the proconsuls and the senate.

An incident which occurred just about the time that the decree to which Dio refers was passed casts light upon the previous situation. In 22 B.C., so Dio tells us,¹ M. Antonius Primus was brought to trial for having engaged in an aggressive war against the Odrysae when proconsul of Macedonia. His defense was at first that he had acted *τῇ τοῦ Ἀνγούστου γνώμῃ*; then that he had acted *τῇ τοῦ Μαρκελλοῦ γνώμῃ*. Augustus thereupon appeared before the court, without waiting to be summoned, and testified that he had given no such advice. This incident is instructive in two particulars. In the first place it is customary to say that down to the middle of 23 B.C. Augustus' possession of the consulship endowed him with the right to direct the administration of the provincial governors. In this instance, however, Primus apparently made no attempt to plead Augustus' *maius imperium*, although it is highly probable that the war which furnished the basis of his accusation was begun while Augustus was still consul. He plead only that he had acted on Augustus' *advice*; and implied that the advice of Marcellus, who was at most aedile at the time, would have been equally justifying. It is, indeed, questionable whether republican precedent would have justified Augustus in issuing a consular order in such a case. Theoretically, to be sure, a consul's authority extended over the whole Empire, and in comparison with that of a proconsul it constituted an *imperium maius*. But in practice the consul's authority came into action only when he was on the spot. Then, of course, he would take command; but we hear nothing of consuls sending orders to proconsuls from Rome. The proconsuls received their orders from the senate and reported to the senate. The second point of interest is that Augustus evidently took the ground that it would have been improper for him to interfere in the administration of a proconsul, even by offering a suggestion. Such at least is a natural inference from his volunteering his evidence. He doubtless felt that if a

¹ liv. 3. 2.

precedent were established of proconsuls coming to him for advice, the provincial dyarchy would soon have come to an end. His prompt disavowal on this occasion must be weighed when considering the probability that at this very time he took the senatorial provinces under his *imperium*.

There is much other incidental evidence that the senatorial provinces were not regarded under the early principate as subject to the princeps' authority. Under Augustus, for example, coins were issued in Asia stamped on one side with the name and symbolic head of the senate. Sometimes these coins bear on the other side the image and superscription of Augustus, but not always. Where these do appear, their presence can readily be explained by the prevalence of the Augustus cult in Asia. Proconsuls both of Asia and of Africa—and even, in one instance dating as late as 4 B.C., an African quaestor—are found issuing coins with their own heads and names and without any reference on them to Augustus.¹ These features of the early coinage are easily explicable if in law Augustus had no *imperium* in the senatorial provinces.

Of more weight is the evidence as to the relations of the earlier emperors to the African army. That until the time of Gaius the relation of the proconsul of Africa to this army was that of an *imperator* is common knowledge among historians. There is evidence, however, which is commonly overlooked and which goes to show that in law he was its only *imperator*, that it was not subject to the princeps' *maius imperium*. It is significant, for example, that while Augustus appropriated the imperial salutations accorded Tiberius, C. Caesar, and Germanicus—all of whom operated in Caesarian provinces—he does not seem to have appropriated the salutations accorded various African proconsuls in his reign;² neither did Tiberius appropriate the imperial salutation of Julius Blaesus.³ The soldiers sent to dispatch Sempronius Gracchus, at the time an exile on an African island, received their orders from the proconsul

¹ Gardthausen, *Augustus*, I, 567 f.; II, 308, 12) and 13).

² See Mommsen, *Res gestae Divi Augusti*, pp. 14 ff.; *Acta triumphalia*; *CIL*, VIII, 16456; Vell. ii. 116. 2; Dio lv. 28. 4.

³ At his accession Tiberius was already *Imp. VII*. He became *Imp. VIII* when saluted by the German army in 16 B.C. (*Tac. Ann.* ii. 18. 2), and continued to be so styled to the end of his life.

apparently, not from the princeps.¹ Finally, there are the following remarkable words of Tacitus:

Caesar post res a Blaeso gestas quasi nullis iam in Africa hostibus reportari nonam legionem iusserat, nec proconsule eius anni P. Dolabella retinere ausus erat, jussa principis magis quam incerta belli metuens.²

Tacitus clearly understands that Dolabella would have had the legal right to reject the princeps' demand, which he certainly would not have had if the princeps had possessed a *maius imperium* in Africa.³

That the senate, not the princeps, was legally the supreme authority over a senatorial province is illustrated by another narrative in Tacitus. At one stage in the war with Tacfarinas, so Tacitus tells us,

missis ad senatum litteris Tiberius motam rursum Africam incursu Tacfarinatis docuit, iudicioque patrum deligendum pro consule gnarum militiae, corpore validum et bello suffecturum. . . . Igitur . . . decretum ut Caesar legeret cui mandanda foret. Proxima senatus die Tiberius per litteras, castigatis oblique patribus quod cuncta curarum ad principem reicerent, M. Lepidum et Iulium Blaesum nominavit, ex quis pro consule Africae legeretur.⁴

It is to be noted that Tiberius does not intervene in the affairs of the province directly, as would have been his right had he possessed an *imperium* over it; but uses his right of *relatio* to call the attention of the senate to the situation. The senate, on the other hand, is obviously anxious to cast its responsibilities upon the emperor. Had the emperor had proconsular authority in Africa, this would have been easy. The senate would have had only to direct him to undertake the war himself. This recourse, however, seems not to have been thought of. Other instances of the senate acting as the supreme authority over the senatorial provinces will occur to the memory of

¹ Tac. Ann. i. 53. 9.

² Tac. Ann. iv. 23. 2.

³ Another indication that the princeps was not regarded as possessing military *imperium* in senatorial provinces is the fact that apparently the military levies in such provinces were conducted by the proconsuls (Mommsen, *Staatsrecht*, II³, 850). If Mommsen is correct, P. Sulpicius Quirinus conducted a war in Cyrenaica under his own auspices in the reign of Augustus (*Res gestae Divi Augusti*, pp. 161-78).

⁴ Tac. Ann. iii. 32. 1, 3; iii. 35. 1.

every reader of the *Annals*; and while it is true that there are numerous passages in our sources which represent the emperor as regulating the affairs of these provinces on his own authority, in many instances a comparison of parallel accounts in other authors makes it clear that the emperor acted through the senate.¹ This, we may believe, was regarded as the proper course.²

Nevertheless it was clear almost from the beginning that the senate's monopoly of power over the "public" provinces could not last. The senate had neither the force nor the spirit to resist the encroachments of the emperor. Indeed, it was only too eager to surrender its responsibilities to him, while the provincials were disposed to go behind its authority and to present their pleas to the real master of the world.

Direct intervention in the affairs of the senatorial provinces on the part of the princeps occurred even under the most constitutionally minded rulers. Tiberius, for example, gave advice to the proconsul of Africa at a critical stage of the war against Tacfarinas.³ Tiberius also criticized another African proconsul for not conferring upon a soldier the civic crown, and then made good the omission himself.⁴ This incident might justify the inference that Tiberius had an *imperium maius* in Africa, were it not for the weight of evidence on the other side. As it is, Tiberius' act must be explained in another way, as a slight and harmless usurpation of authority, an exercise by Tiberius of his *proconsulare imperium* outside his *provincia*.

Under tyrants like Gaius and Nero, it was natural that usurpations of power should take place that were neither slight nor harmless. Thus we find Gaius fetching noble youths from Asia to be exhibited at the games,⁵ ordering famous statues to be brought to Rome from Greece,⁶ and assassinating⁷ or summoning to Rome for punishment⁸

¹ E.g., compare Dio liii. 14. 2 with Suet. *Aug.* 36; Dio lii. 42. 4 with Tac. *Ann.* xii. 23. 1; Suet. *Tib.* 37. 3 and Dio lvii. 24. 6 with Tac. *Ann.* iv. 36. 2-3 (note the context).

² Though, of course, a megalomaniac, such as Nero became in his later years, would naturally disregard it. Cf. the terms of his proclamation of freedom to the Greeks. *Bull. de corr. hell.*, XII (1888), 510.

³ Tac. *Ann.* iii. 73. 4.

⁴ Tac. *Ann.* iii. 21. 4.

⁵ Suet. *Cal.* 58.

⁶ Suet. *Cal.* 22. 2. These were afterward restored to their owners by Claudius (Dio lx. 6. 8).

⁷ Suet. *Cal.* 57. 3.

⁸ Dio lix. 29. 3.

a proconsul of Asia during his term of office. We find Nero also sending out agents to rob the temples of Greece and Asia of their chief ornaments,¹ and ordering all the historic games of Greece to be concentrated in the same year, in order that he might be able to contend at them all.² Such acts, of course, are to be classed as mere abuses of power. That Nero's robbery of the shrines of Asia was an illegality is shown by the fact that the proconsul of the province refused to interfere when the provincials mobbed Nero's agent.³

But the emperor might intervene in a senatorial province in various ways without any impropriety. Like any private citizen, he might make gifts to the states in the province. Augustus, for example, presented public works to Nemausus and Vienna in Narbonese Gaul even after making over that province to the senate.⁴ Tiberius undertook to rebuild the temple of Venus at Mount Eryx.⁵ Gaius⁶ and Nero⁷ both contemplated digging a canal through the Isthmus of Corinth. We find emperors making gifts of money to cities suffering from earthquake or other extraordinary calamity.⁸ Under this head will come the construction of roads by the emperors in senatorial provinces.⁹

Furthermore, the emperor had estates in the senatorial provinces and the senatorial provinces owed certain contributions to the imperial *fiscus*. The management of these estates and the collection of these contributions necessitated the residence in these provinces of an imperial "agent" (*procurator*). Until the time of Claudius this agent had the legal status simply of a private person. He had to resort to the court of the proconsul to enforce the rights of his master.¹⁰

In this connection may be noted the preamble to a letter of Claudius correcting the abuses of the postal service, which was found at

¹ Tac. *Ann.* xv. 45. 1-4.

² Suet. *Nero* 23.

³ Tac. *Ann.* xvi. 23. 1.

⁴ *CIL*, XII, 3151, 5034c (p. 862).

⁵ Tac. *Ann.* iv. 43. 6.

⁶ Suet. *Cal.* 21.

⁷ Suet. *Nero* 19. 2; Dio lxi. 16.

⁸ E.g., Suet. *Cal.* 21; Tac. *Ann.* ii. 47. 3; xvi. 13. 5; Dio liv. 23. 7.

⁹ E.g., *CIL*, III, 346.

¹⁰ Tac. *Ann.* iv. 15. 3; Dio lvii. 23. 4-5.

Tegea in Arcadia.¹ Mommsen refers to this inscription as proof that Claudius' proconsular authority extended over the senatorial province of Achaea.² But the post was an imperial service, and its regulation belonged to the emperor. We learn from the fragment itself that its exactions were felt even in Italy,³ yet no one will maintain that Italy was subject to the emperor's proconsular authority.

We are on controversial ground when we come to consider the *cognitiones* held by the emperors from Augustus onward into cases arising out of the senatorial provinces. Considerable ingenuity has been expended in attempts to find the legal basis for the emperor's right of *cognitio* in general; but the present writer hopes to show in a later paper that the imperial *cognitio* was originally simply what the word implies, viz., an extra-legal *investigation* which the vast moral responsibility of the emperor compelled him to make before throwing his influence into one or the other scale of a disputed question. If this view be correct, the fact that we find the emperors from Augustus onward investigating problems arising in senatorial provinces cannot be used to prove that they possessed any legal authority over those provinces.⁴

Suetonius tells us that under Augustus, *regem Archelaum Trallianos et Thessalos varia quisque de causa Augusto cognoscente defendit* (sc. Tiberius).⁵ In the case of Archelaus, king of Cappadocia, the competence of Augustus is clear enough; for the problem of his fate fell to Augustus to decide by virtue of the fact that Augustus was responsible for Syria, the province adjoining his kingdom. The case of Tralles is also simple. Tralles sent an embassy to Augustus in Spain in 26 or 25 B.C., asking relief from the consequences of an earthquake.⁶ Tiberius was at the time serving with his stepfather in the army.⁷ If, as is probable, this was the occasion of the *cognitio* referred to, it will be noted that the

¹ *CIL*, III, 7251.

² *Staatsrecht*, II³, 860, n. 2.

³ Cf. also the coin of Nerva inscribed *vehiculatio Italica remissa* (Eckhel., VI, 408).

⁴ So Greenidge, *Roman Public Life*, pp. 385 f.

⁵ *Tib.* 8.

⁶ For references, see Mommsen, *Res gestae Divi Augusti*, pp. 159 f.

⁷ Suet. *Tib.* 9.

cognitio was not a judicial proceeding in any sense, but simply an inquiry into the city's need of the imperial generosity. The circumstances out of which the Thessalian *cognitio* arose cannot, apparently, be made out.

But the inscriptions furnish two instances of *cognitiones* under Augustus which, so far as their subject-matter is concerned, can only be regarded as judicial appeals.

In an inscription found at Cos¹ we have a part of what was evidently a letter addressed by a proconsul of Asia to the free city of Cos regarding a suit which a citizen of Cos had instituted before Augustus. The proconsul intimates that the suit ought to have been tried by him before being submitted to the emperor, and that in any case the deposit prescribed in his edict ought to have been made. The other inscription² is a copy of a letter of Augustus in 6 B.C. to the free city of Cnidus containing his findings in a case submitted to him by envoys sent by the city authorities. Augustus writes that he has had "Gallus Asinius, my friend" put the slaves of the accused to the question, and pronounces sentence on the basis of the evidence thus acquired. Asinius Gallus we know to have been proconsul of Asia at the time.

These inscriptions illustrate in the first place the willingness of the provincials to submit their cases to the emperor. Secondly, the excuse for submitting the case to the emperor was in each instance the same. Both Cos and Cnidus were free cities; and free cities were technically outside the jurisdiction of the governor of the provinces in which they were situated, although under the Republic this principle had been honored in the breach quite as much as in the observance. Finally, both inscriptions contain an intimation that the appeal to the emperor was irregular. In the first, the proconsul says in so many words that the case ought to have been tried by him before being referred to Augustus. This position he could hardly have taken if the princeps had had an *imperium* in the province; for the conception of an *imperium maius* was not that of an appellate jurisdiction, but rather that of a co-ordinate jurisdiction

¹ Paton and Hicks, *Inscriptions of Cos*, pp. 41-44.

² *Bull. de corr. hell.*, VII (1883), 62. It is given in full in Gardthausen, *Augustus*, II, 309, n. 17.

which when invoked took precedence over the *imperium minus*. The proconsul, it is true, admits by implication that after he has pronounced his decision the parties might appeal to the princeps. But that it would have taken considerable hardihood on his part to deny. If the princeps chose to investigate the case, who would dare to say him nay? In the second case, for example, Augustus does investigate the charge; but it is to be noted that what he does in effect is to refer it to the proconsul of Asia. He does not appoint an investigating commissioner of his own. So far as he can, without refusing to listen to the plaint of a city which in the imperial cult was taught to recognize him as its divine protector, he complies with the legal principle that the supreme judge in the province was the proconsul.

Under Claudius we have a couple of incidents which suggest how this custom of the emperor's investigating provincial problems for himself might easily give rise to a regular-customary jurisdiction. Dio tells a story, which may be too good to be true, of how Claudius, who was a busybody and liked to examine cases for himself, once was hearing the complaints of the provincials of Bithynia against their governor. Unfortunately, when the complainants were called upon to speak, they all spoke at once, so that the old emperor could not understand. Accordingly he asked Narcissus to interpret, and that wily freedman, who was a friend of the accused governor, told the emperor that the provincials were cheering the latter. "Very well, then," said Claudius, "let him be governor for another year."¹ The story may be apocryphal; but it suggests the reflection that an appellate jurisdiction over the senatorial provinces might easily come into existence under an emperor willing to listen to the provincials' complaints.

The other story is less picturesque, though better attested. When the province of Cyrene was left by its last king to Rome, the royal estates passed to the Roman people. Under the careless rule of the dying Republic, the neighboring landowners encroached upon these estates. Hence under Claudius disputes arose as to the boundaries of the public and the private land, and Claudius sent out a commissioner to investigate the question. The commissioner dispossessed

¹ Dio lx. 33. 5.

many persons of land that they had held for generations; consequently under Claudius' successor he was prosecuted by the province for abuse of power. The senate refused to entertain the case on the ground that the accused had acted as a representative of the princeps and that the court had no means of knowing his instructions.¹ We have here Claudius delegating his power of *cognitio*. We have further the provincials protesting that Claudius' commissioner acted illegally, presumably because the princeps had no legal authority over Cyrenaiica and therefore could delegate none. Finally, we find the senate practically taking the stand that an agent of the princeps is immune provided that he obeys his principal's instructions—in other words, that the emperor can do no wrong.

In the next to last year of Claudius' reign, the senate definitely sanctioned an invasion of the proconsul's rights which had become not uncommon in practice. In the year 53 A.D., according to Tacitus, *saepius audita vox principis parem vim rerum habendam a procuratoribus suis iudicatarum ac si ipse statuisset. Ac ne fortuito videretur, senatus quoque consulto cautum plenius quam antea et uberius.*²

The imperial *procuratores* had for some time³ been exercising without right the summary powers characteristic of ancient tax-gatherers generally. Claudius maintains that his agents have as much right to hear and adjust complaints as he himself; and the senate, rather than have its authority over its provinces ignored, orders the *procuratores* to exercise the functions which they have been exercising illegally. Thereafter the imperial agents in the senatorial provinces possessed jurisdiction in cases related to the *fiscus*.⁴ Yet as late as the day of Ulpian it was recognized that even such cases ought properly to come before the proconsul of the province, and that if he did not insist upon trying them it was only out of respect to the emperor. Ulpian clearly regards the procurator's jurisdiction as an intrusion, a view which hardly consists with the idea that the emperor whose delegate the procurator was had a *maius imperium* in the province.

¹ Tac. Ann. xiv. 18. 2-3.

² Tac. Ann. xii. 60. 1.

³ Cf. Tac. Ann. iv. 15. 3.

⁴ Ulpian apud Dig. I. xvi. 9; *nec quidquam est in provincia quod non per ipsum (sc. proconsulem) expediatur. Sane si fiscalis pecuniaria causa sit quae ad procuratorem principis respicit, melius fecerit si absteineat.*

Two letters of Vespasian are extant which illustrate ways in which the imperial authority over the senatorial provinces insensibly grew.

One is to the city of Sabora in Hispania Baetica. The authorities of Sabora had written, apparently, to Vespasian asking permission to style the new city, which they were building in the plain, *Flavia*; and requesting that it be permitted to enjoy the revenues granted by Augustus to the old city on the hill, together with certain new ones. Vespasian in his extant reply accepts the dedication of the new city to himself and confirms the grant of revenues made by Augustus, but adds: *si qua nova (sc., vectigalia) adicere voltis, de his procos. adire debebitis; ego enim nullo respondente constituere nil possum.*¹

In this letter we see the imperial prerogative growing in three respects: It might seem that Vespasian was well within his rights in consenting that a city should call itself by his name; but under Augustus it was the senate which issued permission to cities to call themselves *Augusta*.² Secondly, we find the city appealing to Vespasian, not to the senate, for a confirmation of the privileges granted it by Augustus. It is not difficult to see how this error on their part could arise. The charter of Sabora had undoubtedly been drawn up by Augustus while in Spain. The town records would show that its provisions had been fixed by him; but they almost certainly would contain no mention of the subsequent senatorial decree confirming Augustus' acts in Gaul and Spain *en bloc*,³ on which the validity of the charter technically depended. The noteworthy thing is that Vespasian himself apparently ignores that decree also, and assumes that he has the right to regrant what his predecessor had granted. Thirdly, he does homage to constitutional rights by referring the citizens of Sabora to the proconsul if they wished any extension of their revenues; but at the same time he practically promises that in case they and the proconsul fail to agree, he will investigate the matter himself. The proper authority to grant any extension of revenues and to hear appeals from the proconsul of senatorial province was, of course, not the princeps but the senate.

¹ *CIL*, II, 1423.

² Dio liv. 23. 7-8.

³ Dio liii. 28. 1.

The other letter is one addressed by Vespasian to the township of the Venacini in Corsica.¹ In it we again find Vespasian confirming privileges granted by Augustus. We also find him instructing his procurator in the province to decide a dispute which had arisen between the Venacini and the town of Mariana regarding the bounds of certain lands which the former had purchased from the imperial domain. In this procedure the principle is discernible that any case involving imperial rights, however remotely, had better be referred to the emperor.²

By the beginning of the second century of our era, the relations of the emperor to the senatorial provinces had become increasingly intimate, and the independence of the proconsuls had been correspondingly undermined. Their military authority was now completely gone. The abstraction of the African legion from the command of the proconsul of Africa had left the princeps the only *imperator* in the Roman world. Henceforth the phrase *provinciae inermes* comes to be synonymous with the phrase *provinciae publicae*, and the word *exercitus* a substitute for the words *provinciae Caesaris*. By Dio's time—we know not how much earlier—the non-military character of the proconsul's office was indicated by his dress. While the legates who governed the imperial provinces wore military uniform and were girt with a sword, the proconsuls were required to dress as civilians and were not allowed to wear a sword, the latter restriction being meant to indicate, according to Dio, that they lacked the power of military discipline.³ Therefore on the rare occasions on which a senatorial province was a prey to armed disturbance, the authorities were helpless until chance or the emperor sent them an imperial force under an imperial officer.⁴

The judicial independence of the proconsuls was disappearing also, through the growth of the imperial *cognitiones*. These, however, infringed even more upon the power of the senate than they did upon that of the proconsuls. The willingness of the emperor to listen led

¹ *CIL*, X, 8038. It is not certain whether Corsica at this time was an imperial or a senatorial province.

² There are a number of enlightening letters from emperors to states in senatorial provinces in the last edition of Dittenberger, *Sylloge inscriptionum Graecarum*, Vol. III.

³ Dio llii. 13. 3, 7.

⁴ E.g., Tac. *Hist.* ii. 8-9; iii. 47-48.

the provincials to lay their problems and requests before him direct. In such a case the decision of the emperor would doubtless be communicated by him to the senate for its formal acceptance; but any independent consideration of the problem by the senate would in effect be estopped. That this was the usual procedure in Tacitus' time is suggested by his note of surprise that Tiberius should lay provincial problems before the senate for its serious discussion.¹ We can hardly imagine Vespasian allowing the senate any genuine freedom of decision; certainly not Domitian. In this, as in other respects, the Flavian era marked a distinct advance in the direction of absolute monarchy.

In the second century all these tendencies continued to work. Trajan sent an army into Cyrenaica to subdue Jewish insurgents there.² The erection of a regular imperial court of appeal under Hadrian must have encouraged the submission of cases from the senatorial provinces. The fact that Augustus during his eastern tour had established certain regulations for the municipalities of Bithynia leads Pliny to refer to Trajan a question as to their interpretation.³ The similar activities of Augustus in Spain were doubtless the justification of Pius' assumption of the right to confirm a *collegium* in the town of Hispalis in Baetica.⁴ The travels of Trajan and Hadrian in the provinces must have brought the emperor and the provincials closer together.⁵ Perhaps the introduction of the title proconsul into the imperial style, which was an innovation of Trajan's, may have some significance in this connection.⁶ Even more important and significant was another innovation of Trajan's. In the administration of the provincial cities inefficiency and corruption were all too common. Trajan therefore began the practice of appointing imperial *correctores* to oversee the conduct of the municipal officials. At first this form of intervention was confined to the

¹ Ann. iii. 60. 1.

² Ep. ad Traj. 79, 80.

³ Dio lxviii. 32. 3.

⁴ CIL, II, 1167.

⁵ Thus we find Trajan granting to the city of Nicomedia the right to hold certain games (Mommsen, *Staatsrecht* II², 860, n. 3), and Hadrian granting similar privileges to Athens (Dio lxix. 16). In the former instance, however, the act seems to have been formally confirmed by the senate.

⁶ According to Greenidge, it "hints at the practical disappearance of the dual control abroad and suggests the all-embracing nature of the emperor's *imperium*" (*Roman Public Life*, p. 353).

free cities, which technically were not part of any province, but ere long it was extended to cities which were in the strict sense parts of senatorial provinces.¹

Bearing all these tendencies in mind, and bearing in mind also the deliberate subjugation of the senate which characterized all but the last of the Severi, it is not surprising that Ulpian and Dio in the beginning of the third century should take for granted that the "public" provinces were under the emperor's authority, quite as much as the imperial provinces. Nevertheless the old tradition was long in dying out. As late as the reign of the emperor Tacitus it was recognized that the proper court of appeal from the senatorial proconsul was the senate, which by that time had come to be presided over by the city prefect;² and even under Diocletian the two great proconsuls of Asia and Africa were still exempt from the jurisdiction of the pretorian prefect.³

UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA

¹ For this development see Mommsen, *Staatsrecht*, II², 857 f., 861, nn. 2 and 3.

² *Vita Floriani* 5. 3, 6. 2 = *Vita Taciti* 18. 3, 19. 2.

³ Mommsen, *Strafrecht*, p. 283.

STUDIES IN GREEK NOUN-FORMATION

Based in part upon material collected by the late A. W. Stratton.¹

DENTAL TERMINATIONS II. 1

WORDS IN -ās, αντος²

BY CARL D. BUCK

Words in -ās, -αντος² comprise a small group of verbal adjectives formed with -ντ- or -τ-, a few substantives of miscellaneous character, and a considerable number of proper names, personal, geographical, and ethnic.

1. *Words formed with -ντ-*.—The clearest examples are from dissyllabic bases, either in a dissyllabic form, as ἀνδροδάμας, etc., from -δαμα-ντ (cf. ἐδάμασα, πανδαμάτωρ), ἀκάμας from -καμα-ντ- (cf. κάματος), τάλας from ταλα-ντ-³ (cf. ἐτάλασσα, ταλαεργός), or in a monosyllabic form, as πολύτλας, ἄτλας, from -τλα-ντ-, this from τλᾶ- (cf. ἔτλην) with the regular vowel shortening before ντ.

The suffix is that which has its principal seat in the active participles, but which also occurs, in Greek and elsewhere, in words detached from the regular verbal system, as ὁδοῦς, ὀδόντος, Lat. *dēns, dentis*, or γέρων, Skt. *jarant-*. The passive force which must be assumed for ἀδάμας as applied to a hard metal ('unconquered'), and likewise for the (earlier) proper name Ἀδάμας, is noteworthy. But the active force would be less insistently felt in this type than in the regular participles, and ἀκάμας, properly intransitive 'untiring' but equivalent to 'unwearied,' may have been a special factor in

¹ Cf. Introductory Note, CP. 5. 323 ff.

² Exclusive of aorist and other participles belonging to the regular verb-system, and also of contracted forms of -αεις, -αεντος.

³ The stem ταλαντ-, usually replaced by ταλαν-, is attested by Choeroboscus 1. 268. 33, quoting from Hipponax (τάλαντι) and Callimachus (αινοτάλαντα). Hom. τάλαντα 'scales' is a neuter plural of this stem, to which was formed later the o-stem singular τάλαντον. Cf. Kretschmer, *Glotta* 3. 266 ff., Solmsen *IF* 31. 497 ff.

An uncertain example of this type is ἐβρυκάς Hesych., beside ἐβρυκάων. If correct, it presumably has ντ-inflection and points to -κοφα-ντ-. Cf. ἐκόαμες Hesych.

[CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY XVI, January, 1921] 51

the use of *ἀδάμας*. Note also the coexistence of active and passive meaning in the verbal adjectives formed with *-τ-*, as *-βλῆς* (CP. 12. 174).

The pronoun *πᾶς*, stem *παντ-*, is, according to its most probable explanation (Brugmann, *Totalität* 61), a similar formation from IE. *kwā-* 'swell' (Skt. *ṣvā-*, Gr. *κύω*), the semantic development being from 'swelling, swollen' to 'full, whole.' Besides the well-known intensive compounds *ἄπας*, *σύμπας*, *πρόπας*, we find also Boeot. *ἔμπας*, IG. 7. 2712. 19, and Cret. *ἐπίπας*, SGDI. 4983, 5026, 5039. With the latter compare also *ἀνάπας*, i.e. *ἀνά-πας*, Anth. P. 7. 343.

2. *Words formed with -τ-*.—The stem of *ὑπερκύδας* is to be analyzed as *κυδαν-τ-*, formed from the verb-stem of *κυδαίνω* with the same *-τ-* which is in Greek most commonly added to root-forms ending in *ā*, *η*, or *ω*, as in *προβλής*, etc. (CP. 12. 174). Words of this type may have active or passive force, and *ὑπερκύδας*, in the passages of Homer and Hesiod where it occurs, is not passive ('exceeding renowned,' *L. & S.*), but active 'boasting,' cf. Brugmann, IF. 11. 291 ff. The same stem appears in *Κύδας*, Cret. *Κύδανς*, and examples of the same formation are seen in other proper names, as *Κέρδας* (*κερδαίνω*), *Ὀνόμας* (*ὀνομαίνω*), *Περίφας* (*φαίνω*), etc. So possibly *Γίγας*, rarely appellative *γίγας*, from a **γιγαίνω* related to *γίγνομαι*, but the name may well be of non-Greek origin. *γίγγρας*, if it has *vr*-inflection,¹ is from *γιγγραίνω* implied by *γιγγραντά*.

3. *Miscellaneous substantives*.—Under this head are grouped a series of words the analysis of which requires discussion for each individual case, though some of them are attributable to one of the two foregoing types.

ἱμάς is related to OE. *sīma* 'band, rope,' Skt. *sīman-* 'part in the hair, boundary,' for which **ἱμων* (cf. *ἱμονιά*) is the equivalent to be expected in Greek. Brugmann, IF. 11. 293 ff., assumes a derivative **ἱμαίνω* 'provide with a band, fasten,' whence *ἱμαν-τ-* (like *κυδαν-τ-* from *κυδαίνω*), which then like many other agent-nouns was applied to a material object (cf. Eng. *fastener*), so that

¹ The evidence rests solely on the passage of Amphis quoted in Ath. 175, where Kaibel now reads *τὸν γίγγραν γε* (MS *γίγγραντε*), while Meineke, *Fr. Com. Gr.*, following Dindorf, reads *τὸν γίγγραντα*.

it came to have the same meaning as, and displaced the original noun from which the assumed **ιμαίνω* was formed. Instead of following this available but circuitous route, one must prefer, if possible, to see in *ιμαντ-* a simple extension of the original *n*-stem noun (cf. *χαριτ-* beside *χάρι-*, Skt. *harit-* beside *hari-*, and *śimanta-* beside *śīman-*). The obvious difficulty, namely that from an inherited by-form with *t*-extension one would get **ιμοντ-* or **ιματ-*, may be overcome by assuming a prehistoric but specifically Greek extension on the basis of an antevocalic weak form **ιμαν-* (e.g., gen. sg. **ιμανος*).

ἀνδριάς, obviously derived from *ἀνήρ* and no doubt first applied only to figures of men, is explained by Brugmann, *loc. cit.*, through the medium of an **ἀνδρῖαίνω* 'have the characteristics of man,' whence *ἀνδριαντ-* 'that which represents man.' In the absence of any trace of such a verb or of any *n*-stem to make its existence especially probable (though of course verbs in *-αίνω* from other than *n*-stems are plentiful enough), one can have no confidence that this is the particular missing link needed. What one looks for, but fails to find in the extant material, is some noun in *-(ι)ας*, *-(ι)αντος* containing the notion of 'shape, figure,' after the analogy of which *ἀνδριάς* could be formed directly from *ἀνήρ*.

ὀκρίβας, *κιλλίβας*, *λυκάβας*, *ἀλιβας*.—These rare and difficult words have the appearance of belonging together, and for the first three derivation from *βαίνω* is commonly assumed. *ὀκρίβας* is a technical term for (1) a platform from which actors declaimed,¹ (2) the buskin with very thick soles worn by actors to increase the stature,² (3) the painter's easel,³ (4) some part of a chariot,⁴ and other kinds of supports or "risers."⁵ For all these uses the old derivation from *ὀκρίς* and *βαίνω* is satisfactory. Only *ὀκρι-* represents an adjective, originally 'sharp, pointed' (cf. *ἀκρός*, Lat.

¹ Plat. *Symp.* 194b: ἀναβαλόντος ἐπὶ τὸν ὀκρίβαντα μετὰ τῶν ὑποκριτῶν. Schol. ὀκρίβαντα: τὸ λογιεῖον ἐφ' οὗ οἱ τραγωδοὶ ἠγωνίζοντο. τινὲς δὲ κιλλίβαντα τρισκέλη φασιν, ἐφ' οὗ ἴσταντο οἱ ὑποκριταί.

² Philostr. *vit. Apoll.* 5. 9; 6. 10; *vit. Sophist.* 1. 9. Themist. *Orat.* 316d; *Et. Mag.* s.v.; Hesych. ὀκρίβαντας· ἐμβάτας.

³ Poll. 7. 129; 10. 163.

⁴ Phot., Suid., Hesych.: ὀκρίβας· σχῆμα (or ὄχημα) ἡνίοχου. Obscure.

⁵ Cf. Suid. καὶ τὰ ὑπερῆματα τῶν ξυλίων θεάτρων.

ācer, etc.), whence 'projecting, high, raised,' and the question arises whether *-βαντ-* is to be analyzed as *-βα-ντ-* from *βᾶ-* of *ἔβην*, or as *-βαντ-* from *βαν-* of *βαίνω*. The latter is to be preferred, since the suffix *t* occurs in nouns of action (cf. *δαίς*, Skt. *stut-* 'praise') as well as in those of agency, and the transfer from action to place would be parallel to that seen in *βῆμα* and *βάσις*.

κλλιβας is likewise a technical term for various kinds of stands and supports, e.g., a stand for shields,¹ table-base or three-legged table,² part of a chariot-frame,³ supports for a platform,⁴ part of an engine of war,⁵ and a painter's easel.⁶ It is derived from *κίλλος* 'ass,'⁷ which might without change in form be used for a stand or support, like Eng. *horse*, *easel* = Ger. *Esel*, Ger. *Bock*, or, in a diminutive form, Fr. *chevalet*. From both the formal and semantic point of view, *κλλιβας* is best understood, not as the result of independent composition, but as formed from *κίλλος*, in its transferred sense, on the analogy of *ὀκρίβας*, which is so closely allied in meaning.

Λυκάβας in Hom. *Od.* 14. 161 = 19. 306 denotes a fixed period of time, presumably 'year,'⁸ as it was certainly understood by the late writers⁹ who used the word in imitation of Homer. The most reasonable analysis, despite objections and rival suggestions,¹⁰ is *λυκα-βαντ-* 'light-course.' The second element is *-βαντ-* as a noun of action (see above), and the first contains the weak grade of

¹ Aristoph. *Ach.* 1122, *κλλιβαρτες ἄσπιδος*.

² Schol. Aristoph., *loc. cit.*; Hesych.

³ Poll. 1. 143.

⁴ Athen. 208c.

⁵ Bito de Mach. 110, 111 (= Wescher, *Poliorcétique des Grecs*, 58, 59).

⁶ Poll. 7. 129; 10. 163.

⁷ Hesych. s.v. Poll. 7. 56.

⁸ Stengel, *Hermes* 18. 304 ff., argues that the meaning in Homer is not 'year' but 'month.'

⁹ Ap. Rh., Bion, late metrical inscriptions, and coins. See *L. & S.*

¹⁰ Johansson, *Beitr. z. gr. Sprachkunde* 16 ff., objects that *-βαντ-* "kann unmöglich 'gang' bedeuten" and could only have participial force (but see above), and analyzes *λυκα-βαντ-* with a succession of suffixes. Fick, *Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1894, 240, followed by Bechtel, *Lexilogus* 218, analyzes *λυκα-βας*, referring to Hesychius' gloss *ἄβα· τροχός* (*τρόχος*). But if Fick's further identification of *ἄβα* with late Lac. *ῶβά* and the corresponding gloss *ῶγῆ· κόμη*, in which *β* and *γ* stand for *φ*, is accepted, it can have nothing to do with a Homeric *λυκάβας*.

λευκ- in λευκός, etc. (cf. ἀμφιλύκη, etc.), with ἄ, which is paralleled in Ἄλκα-θοος, Hom. θυράωρος.

άλιβας is a rare expression for 'corpse,' also used for 'vinegar' ('dead wine').¹ The popular etymology of the ancients (cf. the quotations from Plutarch) is hardly the true one, and takes no account of the ντ-inflection. The probable analysis is ἀλι-βαντ-, even though the first element may remain obscure. The supposed evidence for initial long vowel (L. & S., cf. Lobeck, *Prol.* 289) is illusory (cf. Schneider, *Callim.* 2. 253). Without such specific evidence, or any reason to suppose the word is not Attic-Ionic, short α is more probable, and this is implied by the ancient popular etymology. The latter also supports the traditional smooth breathing, although a rival etymology is given in *Et. Mag.*: ἀλιβάντας· τοὺς ἐν θαλάσῃ τελευτήσαντας. On the whole perhaps the most plausible connection is with ἡλίβατος in the sense of 'deep, abysmal' (ἄνθρωπος ἐν ἡλιβάτῳ, etc.), as suggested by Adam, *Republic of Plato* 1. 132. Only we should not assume ἄλι- = ἡλι-, but ἀλι- beside ἡλι-, with vowel gradation.

ἐλέφας, in Homer, Hesiod, Pindar used only in the sense of 'ivory,' from Herodotus on for the 'elephant,' is believed to contain an element which is seen also in Latin *ebur* and which in both cases is borrowed from Egyptian or Semitic (cf. Egypt. *āb* 'ivory,' etc. See Schrader *Reallexicon* 180, and for the preceding ἐλ- the suggestion of Osthoff, *Parerga* 281). There is nothing in the foreign origin to explain the stem in -αντ-, which must be due to the analogy of some Greek word, very likely ἀδάμας, which the ivory rivaled in hardness.

The Sicilian coin-names διξᾶς, τριᾶς, τριξᾶς, τετρᾶς, ἐξᾶς,² are formed on the model of Italic denominations of the type represented

¹ Plat. *Rep.* 387c: οὐκοῦν ἔτι καὶ τὰ περὶ ταῦτα ὀνόματα πάντα τὰ δεινὰ τε καὶ φοβερά ἀποβλητέα, κωκυτοὺς τε καὶ στῆγας καὶ ἐνέρους καὶ ἀλίβαντας, καὶ ἄλλα οὖτοις τοῦ τύπου ὀνομαζόμενα φρίττειν δὴ ποιῇ πάντας τοὺς ἀκούοντας.

Plut. *Mor.* 736a: ὁ δ' ἀλίβας καὶ ὁ σκελετὸς ἐπὶ τοῖς νεκροῖς λέγονται, λοιδοροῦμένης τῇ ὀνόματι τῆς ξηρότητος. *Ibid.*, 958a: ἀμίλει τοὺς ἀποθανόντας 'ἀλίβαντας' καλοῦσιν ὡς ἐνδεεῖς 'λιβάδος' τουτέστιν ὑγρότητος.

Callim. fr. 88: ἔβηξαν ὅλον ἀλίβαντα πίνοντες (= οἱ ἀλίβαντα πίνοντες. Cf. Schneider, *Callim.* 2. 253).

Orion 30. 15 (says word occurs in Hipponax); Suidas; *Et. Mag.*; Eust 1237. 22, 1679. 33; Schol. Aristoph. *Frogs* 194; Hdn. 2. 656. 5.

² Poll. 4. 174-5 and 9. 81, in both cases quoting from Aristotle. 4. 174-5. οἱ Σικελιώται τοὺς μὲν δύο χαλκοὺς διξᾶντα (MSS διξᾶντα, διξᾶντα, ἔξᾶντα. Bethe adopts

by Lat. *quadrans*, *sextans*, etc. This is so clearly in accord with other evidence of the early introduction in Sicily of an Italic coinage system (cf. νοῦμμος, οὐγκία, and λίτρα from **liþrā*, whence Lat. *libra*), that independent derivation of τετραῖς from *τετρα-φεντ- (Brugmann-Thumb 235) is most unlikely.

πελεκᾶς 'woodpecker' has ντ-inflection, after the analogy of participles, in Aristoph. *Birds* (πελεκᾶντι 889, πελεκᾶντες 1155; cf. partic. πελεκῶντων 1157). The word belongs properly with other bird-names, ἐλεᾶς, ἐλασᾶς, βασκᾶς, etc. (dat. sg. ἐλεῖ, etc., *Birds* 885), and so to the colloquial type of nicknames like φαγᾶς, τρεσᾶς, χεσᾶς, etc., which are not ντ-stems (χεσᾶς, χεσᾶντος in *L. & S.* is an error).

πάλλας, πάλλαντος 'neos,' attested only by Eustathius (84. 42, 1419. 50, 1742. 37), is if genuine a variant form of πάλλαξ (cf. Mod. Gr. παλληκάρι 'young fellow, warrior').

4. *Personal names.*—The largest distinct group consists of the compounds in -δάμας. Several of these are most familiar as names of legendary heroes, namely the Homeric 'A-, 'Αμφι-, Εὔρυ-, 'Ιππο-, Λαο-, Πουλυ-, Χερσι-δάμας. But these, all but the last, occur also, with many others, in all over 35, as historical names. Only a few of these, as 'Ιππο-, Λαο- (Λα-, Λεω-, Λεο-), Πολυ- (Πουλυ-) δάμας, are at all common, but examples of the type are widely distributed.¹ On the other hand, the compound names in -φας (-φαν-τ-, from

the first, which is inexplicable) καλοῦσι, τὸν δ' ἓνα οὐγκίαν, τοὺς δὲ τρεῖς τριᾶντα. 9. 81. καὶ διξᾶντα, ὅπερ ἐστὶ δύο χαλκοὶ, καὶ τριξᾶντα, ὅπερ τρεῖς. The same coin is called τριᾶς in the first passage, τριξᾶς in the second. The latter is formed like διξᾶς (cf. διξός, τριξός = δισός, τρισός). The former occurs in Hesych. τριᾶντος πόρνη· λαμβάνουσα τριᾶντα ὃ ἐστὶ λεπτὰ εἴκοσι. τετραῖς Hesych. (coin and 'quadrant,' in latter sense also Vitruv.). ξῆς Hesych. and Hdn. 1. 54. 17 (where the accentuation ξῆς is prescribed).

¹ Miss Macurdy, *JHS.* 39. 64, comments on the overwhelmingly Trojan character of the Homeric names in -δάμας, with the exception of 'Αμφιδάμας, and quotes similar names of Dardanians, Thracians, and Thessalians, as part of the evidence of "coincidence between the typical Trojan names and those which are found most commonly in the ruling tribes of the northern part of the Balkan peninsula." The general thesis is of great interest and importance, and some of the evidence may not be illusory. But in this case (and likewise for the names beginning with Λαο-) I can see no ground for asserting that the names were especially characteristic of the northern regions. For in the historical period names in -δάμας, only a few of which, as Πουλυδάμας in this form, are clearly due to epic influence, are quotable from all parts of the Greek world, from Thessaly to Laconia, from Coreyra to Crete and Rhodes.

φαίνω, above, p. 52) are legendary only, at least Περίφας, Ἐκφας, Τέρφας, and probably also Πολύφας on a Corinthian vase (*SGDI*. 3126). Likewise Ἄτλας, Ἀκάμας. Of the numerous uncompounded names like Αἴας, Βίας, Θόας, Φείδας, etc., the great majority are legendary or foreign.

Names which are derived from quotable verbs in -αίνω, like Περίφας, etc., are: Δείμας, Ἐρίβας (βαίνω; cf. Ἐρί-τιμος, etc.), Κύδας, Κέρδας, Κάλχας, Οἶδας, Ὀνόμας, Πείρας. For Πρόφρας one may safely assume a *προφραίνω like εὐφραίνω, and for some others actual verbs in -αίνω may have once existed. But, the type once started, such names were formed from other verbs, and from nouns, adjectives, or even adverbs, e.g., Φείδας (φείδομαι), Βίας (βία), Θόας (θοός), Εὔας, epithet of Dionysus (εὐαί).¹ A few names are merely back-formations from place-names with ντ or ν, e.g., Ἄρας, Τεύθρας, reputed founders of Ἀραντία, Τευθρανία. Ζάς, Ζάντος, *Hdn.* 2. 635. 26, etc., is the late hyper-Doric form of Ζῆς, Ζεύς, with ντ-inflection supplied, probably by the grammarians only, after the analogy of other names in -ας, -αντος.

Apart from the names in -δάμας, only about a dozen in -ας, -αντος are quotable as names of Greeks in the historical period. Κύδαυς (see above, p. 52) and Ἐνίπας (cf. ἐνιπή, ἐνίπτω) are common names in Crete (*SGDI*. IV, pp. 1179, 1184), where also once Βάλλας (Ἄρχ. Ἐφ. 1908, 230; nom. only, but *Hdn.* 2. 652. 34 gives gen. Βάλλαντος). There are a few scattered examples of Θόας, from Boeotia (*IG.* 7. 1092), Laconia (*IG.* 5. 1. 20 B 4), Aetolia (*SGDI.* 1730), Termessus (*CIG.* 4363, 4366t). Further, a Delphian Ἐρίβας (*SGDI.* 2757. 3; see above), a Spartan Ὀνόμας (*Arr. An.* 3. 24. 4), a Macedonian Κάλλας (*Diod.* 17. 7. 17, etc.), and Δύμας, Βρύας, Ἀθάμας in a list of "known Pythagoreans" (*Iambl. vit. Pyth.* 36). Ἐλέφας occurs as a personal name (cf. Λέων, Δράκων, etc.) in *IG.* 4. 1484. 102, *IG.* 5. 1. 699, *BCH.* 29. 102, No. 3 (cf. also Polyb. 18. 24. 2).

Ἀρκέσας is a well-attested Athenian name (cf. Kirchner, *Att. Prosop.* Nos. 2206-8; cf. also Ἀρκέσασα *IG.* 2. 3510), and is clearly

¹ It is possible that some of these legendary names in -ας, -αντος are hypocoristic forms of compound names, as assumed by Fick-Bechtel 374. But this is not obviously true of any, and most of them certainly belong to the category of originally simple names.

based on the aorist participle, as is 'Αρκέων, a common Delian name, on the present participle of the same verb. Hence, while this type is rare compared with 'Αρκέων, Θαρρύνων, 'Ελπίζων, and the many others based on present participles, there is no need to regard 'Ονομάσας, Lys. 27. 4, as corrupt, as affirmed by Thalheim. Another example is Τελέσας, which is now quotable, IG. 4. 965, without recourse to the disputed Τελέσαντα τὸν ῥήτορα Ath. 220b (so Meineke after Casaubon. Kaibel assumes a corruption). 'Απέσας, the name of a mountain near Nemea, and of its eponymous hero, the latter written 'Αφέσας in St. Byz., has every appearance of being a similar formation, although the derivation from ἀφέσας, as in St. Byz., ignores the π (local psilosis not impossible) and leaves the semantic relation a series of guesses.

5. *Ethnica*.—These are nearly all names of foreign tribes, as the African 'Ατάραντες, Γαράμαντες, Βύξαντες (of which Γύξαντες, Ζύξαντες are probably corruptions), Celtic Βρίγαντες, Τρινόβαντες, Italic Πικίαντες, Πευκετίαντες, Illyrian 'Αμαντες, Thracian 'Αβαντες, 'Οδόμαντες, and the aboriginal 'Τάντες of Boeotia. Likewise of foreign source is the group-name Κορύβαντες, Κύρβαντες, and perhaps also Γιγαντες. But 'Αφείδαντες, name of a phyle in Tegea, is clearly Greek, from the legendary 'Αφείδας.

6. *Place-names*.—A few of those listed are names of places in foreign lands, as 'Αβας, Γαλάβρας, 'Ελέφας, Κώφας, 'Ρήβας, Σάλγας, Τεύθρας, or mythical, as 'Αλύβας (probably 'Silvertown,' cf. Wackernagel, *Sprachl. Unters. zu Homer* 251) and 'Αλίβας. Even most of those which belong to Greek-speaking territory are without clear etymological connection and very probably of pre-Greek origin, as the famous 'Ακράγας and Τάρας (Κάρας, Λάρας Hdn. 2. 654. 15 also place-names?), the ancient Boeotian Γλισας,¹ the Attic deme Τείθρας,² the stream 'Ακίδας in Triphylia, and the insignificant towns Κύφας, Τρύχας, Πράς, Βάβρας, 'Ακύφας.³

¹ Also accented Γλισᾶς, but cf. Hdn. 1. 50. 18. For Πράς, not Πρᾶς, cf. Hdn. 1. 399. 16. On the other hand, not Πέρπας (Ptol.), but Περρᾶς, belonging with Hom. περρῆες.

² Τείθρας St. Byz., but Attic inscriptions have regularly Τειθράσιοι.

³ 'Αρόας Erastosthenes ap. Hdn. 2. 650. 10 is another place-name, of unknown locality.

'Ακάμας, 'Απέσσας, 'Ατλας, Μίμας, Φόρβας are identical with the names of legendary heroes. Κάλλας, a stream in Euboea, is presumably connected with κάλλος. 'Αστράβας, a locality near Delphi (*CIG.* 1117 A 14), may be connected with ἀστράβη 'saddle' (so Pape). Λιθάμας, a locality mentioned in an inscription defining the boundaries of certain Arcadian towns (*Mnemos.* 42. 332), was perhaps so called from a kind of stone found there, and I will not suppress my fancy that the name rests on a blend of λίθος and ἀδάμας.

7. *Metaplastic forms*.—Some words in -ας, -αντος, mostly proper names, show forms of the masculine \bar{a} -stems, owing to the common nominative in -ᾱς. Thus acc. λεοντοδάμαν *Pind. Dith. fr.* 11. 584, 'Ανδροδάμαν *Paus.* 2. 12. 6, Σωδάμαν *Paus.* 6. 4. 9, gen. 'Αδάμα *IG.* 4. 729. 9, Καρτιδάμα *IG.* 12. 3. 324. 9, etc. (frequent, beside Καρτιδάμαντος), dat. Καρταιδάμαι, *SGDI.* 5016. 23, acc. λυκάβαν *IG.* 12. 129. 8, Αἰάν and Θόαν quoted from Alcaeus and Hesiod (*Hdn.* 2. 649. 30), gen. Θόα *SGDI.* 1730, voc. Πουλυδάμα *Hom. Il.* 12. 231, etc., Λαοδάμα *Od.* 8. 141. 153, Χαρίδα *Callim. ep.* 15 (if really ντ-stem, as *Hdn.* 2. 652. 1). Conversely a few names which are usually inflected as \bar{a} -stems show also ντ-forms, as 'Αμύκλας (ντ- *Hdn.* 2. 653. 12), 'Ιδας (ντ- *Et. M.*). Some foreign names follow indifferently the \bar{a} - or the ντ-inflection, e.g., Μαρικᾱς (*Hdn.* 2. 657. 20), Φθᾱς, 'Ρήβας.

WORD-LIST

Proper names which are to be found in Pape's *Wörterbuch der griechischen Eigennamen* are cited without references.

The ethnica are given in the plural form, for convenience in distinguishing them, even when the singular is in use. Similarly Γίγαντες, Κορίβαντες, etc. But unrecognized ethnica may be concealed in some of the names in -ας which occur only in the grammarians, e.g., Σατίας, Φλεγίτας in Herodian (2. 650. 8), where ethnica expressly stated as such are also given in the singular form.

A few words in which ντ-inflection is only sporadic or even doubtful, or which are of doubtful authenticity, are included in the list, but inclosed in parentheses.

*Αβας [p. 58.

*Αβαντες [p. 58.

Λυκάβας *Hom.* + [pp. 54, 59.

Λυκάβας

(*Ρήβας) [p. 59.

*Αστράβας [p. 59.

Βίβας *Hdn.* 2. 655. 31.

Δίβας *Plat.* + [p. 55.

- Ἀλίβας [p. 58.
 κῶλίβας Aristoph.+ [p. 54.
 Ἐρίβας SGDI. 2757. 3 [p. 57.
 ὀκρίβας Plat.+ [p. 53.
 Ἰάρβας
 Φόρβας [p. 59.
 Κύρβας, Κυρβάντες, see Κορύβας,
 Κορύβαντες
 Ἀρίσβας
 Θίσβας Hdn. 2. 651. 1.
 Ἀλύβας [p. 58.
 Ἀρύβας
 Κορύβας
 Κορύβαντες [p. 58.
 Ἀκράγας [p. 58.
 Γίγαντες [pp. 52, 58.
 γίγας Aesch., Hesych. [p. 52.
 συν- Byz.
 τρι- Orph.
 τραπέζο- Byz.
 αἰνο- Nonn.
 ἀνδρο- Callim.
 Βρίγαντες [p. 58.
 Σάλγας Hdn. 2. 651. 23 [p. 58.
 (Ζύγαντες) [p. 58.
 (Ἴδας) [p. 59.
 Φείδας [p. 57.
 Ἀφείδας [p. 58.
 Ἀφειδαντες [p. 58.
 Μείδας
 Ἀκίδας [p. 58.
 Οἶδας [p. 57.
 Χαρίδας [p. 59.
 Κέρδας [pp. 52, 57.
 Κῦδας, Cret. Κῦδανς [pp. 52, 57.
 ὑπερκῦδας Hom., Hes. [p. 52.
 [Υπερ]κῦδας IG. 5. 2. 368. 108 (suppl.
 Bechtel).
 Ἐλέας
 Παρέας
 Ζάς [p. 57.
 Βύζαντες [p. 58.
 (Γύζαντες) [p. 58.
 Πύζας
 (Φθάς) [p. 59.
 Αἷας [pp. 57, 59.
 Βίας [p. 57.
 Δίας
 Θείας
 Πικίαντες [p. 58.
 Δοίας
 Ποίας
 Παρίας
 ἀνδριάς Pind.+ [p. 53.
 Πρίας
 τριῶς Poll., Hesych. [p. 55.
 Πευκετίαντες [p. 58.
 Ἀφίας
 πελεκῶς Aristoph. [p. 56.
 Πελεκῶς
 (Μαρικῶς) [p. 59.
 τάλας Hipponax [p. 51.
 αἰνο- Callim. [p. 51.
 Δείλας
 Χήλας Hdn. 2. 652. 19.
 (Ἀμύκλας) [p. 59.
 Βάλλας Hdn. 2. 652. 34, Ἀρχ. Ἐφ.
 1908, 230 [p. 57.
 Κάλλας [p. 59.
 πάλλας Eust. [p. 56.
 Πάλλας
 Φέλλας Hdn. 2. 652. 34.
 Κίλλας
 ἄτλας Hesych. [p. 51.
 Ἀτλας [pp. 57, 59.
 Ἀτλαντες
 πολύτλας Hom., Soph. [p. 51.
 Πολύτλας IG. 12. 9. 245 A 274.
 Μύλας
 Φύλας
 Ἀμαντες [p. 58.
 Δάμας
 -δάμας [pp. 51, 56, 59.
 δ- Hes.+
 Ἀ-
 Λα-, see Λαο-
 Ἐχε- IG. 2. 871 a 10.
 Ἀρχε-

-δάμας—

- Καρται- SGDI. 5016. 23.
 Δηϊ- IG. 12. 7. 442.
 Ἄλκι-
 Καλλι-
 κεκραξι- Aristoph.
 Πραξι-
 Δεξι- IG. 7. 557.
 Χερσι-
 Ἄντι- SGDI. 3706 VI 20, 3722. 15.
 Καρτι-
 Ἄμφι-
 Ἴφι-
 Ἀρχι- IG. 12. 9. 249 B 249,
 SGDI. 3626. 14.
 λαο- Aesch.
 Λαο-, Λα-, Λεω-, Λεο-
 Θεο-, Θειο-, Θεν-
 Κλεο-
 Νικο-
 Οἰκο- BCH. 1. 346, Ath. Mitt.
 15. 253.
 χαλκο- Pind.
 Χαλκο- IG. 5. 1. 231.
 Φυλο-
 Δημο-, Δαμο-
 Τιμο- Delphin. in Milet. 138. 69.
 Ἐρμο-
 Ξενο IG. 11. 4. 587. 2.
 τοξο- Aesch.
 Ἴππο-
 Λαβρο- Mélanges gréco-rom. 1.
 441. 3.
 ἀνδρο- Pind., Pliny.
 Ἄνδρο-
 Θηρο-
 ἀργυρο- Plin.
 Ἴσο- IG. 12. 7. 83.
 λεοντο- Pind.
 Ἀριστο-
 Αἰτο- SGDI. 1682. 40.
 Εὔ-
 Εὐθυ-
 Πολυ-, Πουλυ-

-δάμας—

- Εὐρύ-
 Θρασυ- Inscr. Pont. Eux. 1. 11. 3.
 Ἄστυ-
 Λεω-, see Λαο-
 Σω-
 ἀκάμας Hom. + [p. 51.
 Ἄκαμας [p. 59.
 Ἄθαμας [p. 57.
 Λιθάμας Mnemos. 42. 332 [p. 59.
 Μάμας
 Γαράμαντες, Γαρίμαντες [p. 58.
 ἱμάς Hom. + [p. 52.
 Δείμας [p. 57.
 Μίμας [p. 59.
 Βρίμας Hdn. 2. 653. 22.
 Τόλμας Hdn. 2. 653. 19.
 Ὀδόμαντες [p. 58.
 Ὀνόμας [pp. 52, 57.
 Χάρμας
 Θαύμας
 Δύμας [p. 57.
 Ἀμφιδύμας
 Ἐρύμας
 Κάνας Hdn. 2. 653. 34.
 Λύρνας
 Θόας [pp. 57, 59.
 Λευκοθόας Hdn. 2. 649. 37.
 Λυκοθόας Hdn. 2. 649. 37.
 Τρινόαντες [p. 58.
 πᾶς Hom. + [p. 52.
 ἄπας Hom. +
 συν- Hdt. +
 ἀπαξ- Hermipp. +
 ἀνάπας Anth. P. [p. 52.
 Ἐνίπας SGDI. 5040. 2. 59; 5149,
 etc. [p. 57.
 ἐπίπας SGDI. 4983, 5026, 5039
 [p. 52.
 ἔμπας IG. 7. 2712. 69 [p. 52.
 σύμπας Hom. +
 πρόπας Hom. +
 Κύπας Hdn. 2. 654. 1.
 Ἄρας

- Κάρας [p. 58.
 Λάρας [p. 58.
 Τάρας [p. 58.
 Ἀτάραντες [p. 58.
 Βάβρας [p. 58.
 Γαλάβρας [p. 58.
 γίγγρας [p. 52.
 Τεύθρας [p. 58.
 Τεύθρας [pp. 57, 58.
 Πείρας [p. 57.
 Πράς [p. 58.
 τετρῶς Hesych. [p. 55.
 Πρόφρας [p. 57.
 Ὀνομάσας [p. 58.
 Ἀρκέσας [p. 57.
 Ἀρκέσασα IG. 2. 3510 [p. 57.
 Τελέσας IG. 4. 965 [p. 58.
 Ἀπέσας (Ἀφέσας) [pp. 58, 59.
 Γλίσας [p. 58.
 Τελεύτας
 ὕας
 ὕαντες [p. 58.
- Γαίας
 Φλεγίας
 Εὔας [p. 57.
 Ἀρίας Hdn. 2. 650. 10 [p. 58.
 Βρύας [p. 57.
 Δρύας
 Σατίας
 ἑλέφας Hom. + [p. 55.
 ταυρ- Philostorg., Niceph.
 ῥυγχ- Anth. P.
 ἑλέφας [pp. 57, 58.
 Περιφας [pp. 52, 57.
 ἑκφας [p. 57.
 ὕπερφας [p. 57.
 Κύφας [p. 58.
 Πολύφας SGDI. 3126 [p. 57.
 Κορύφας Hdn. 2. 654. 37.
 Κώφας [p. 58.
 Κάλχας [p. 57.
 Κόλχας, Κόλιχας
 Τρύχας [p. 58.

GREEK AND LATIN ETYMOLOGIES

BY FRANCIS A. WOOD

1. Gr. ἄρωμα 'any seasoning, spice, sweet herb' is identical with ἄρωμα *arvum* from the root *arā-rādere, so that ἄρωμα means 'something that scratches, tickles, stimulates, sharpens, whets (the senses)' as well as 'something scratched, plowed.' Similarly κέστρον 'an aromatic plant, *Betonica officinalis*' may be identical with κέστρον 'a pointed iron instrument.' Taste, smell, sight, and sound are regularly described in terms of touch or feeling, (cf. Hor. *Sat.* ii. 8. 7 ff.: *acria circum rapula, lactucae, radices, qualia lassum pervellunt stomachum*, and Nos. 5, 13).

2. Gr. βλάβη, βλάβος 'hurt, damage, loss,' βλάπτω 'disable, weaken, hinder, stop; entangle, catch; deceive (mind); damage, hurt,' Cret. ἀβλοπές· ἀβλαβές Hes., etc., are compared with Skt. *marcāyati*, Lat. *mulco*. But there is no evidence whatever that the initial β is from *m*. Such forms as ἀβλαβής, ἀβλάβεια, ἀβλαπτος, ἀβλοπές, ἀβλοπία, never *ἀμβλαβής, etc., indicate an original *b*. The medial β is assimilated from π, and this is from IE. *q*^u. This then gives us the base *bleq^u, which is in OE. *pleoh* (Germ. *plehwa-) 'danger, peril (to the soul); injury; responsibility, risk,' plēon (*plehwan) 'risk, expose to danger,' OS. *plegan* 'verantwortlich sein, zusichern, versprechen,' 'pledge,' OHG. *pflegan* 'für etwas eintreten, in Obhut nehmen, sorgen für, pflegen, Umgang haben mit, Sitte, Gewohnheit haben,' *phligida* 'Gefahr,' *phliht*, MHG. *phliht*, *pfliht* 'Fürsorge, Pflege, Aufsicht; Verbindung, Verkehr, Gemeinschaft, Obliegenheit, Dienst; Art und Weise,' MLG. *pflicht* 'sittliche und rechtliche Verbindlichkeit, Pflicht; Gemeinschaft, Teilnahme; Zins, Abgabe (wozu man verpflichtet ist); Dienst, Leistung; Gehalt, Lohn,' OE. *pliht* 'danger; damage,' *plihtan* 'bring danger upon,' NE. *plight* 'bind one's self by pledging, engage by solemn promise, pledge, etc.'

The primary meaning of the root *bleq^u was 'hold, bind,' or the like. This would explain the meanings of Gr. βλάπτω 'hinder, disable, entangle' (πόδας γούνατα); 'hold, hinder from' (τινὰ κελεύθου);

'capture, deceive' (*φρένας*, whence *βλαφθεῖς mente captus*); 'entangle, catch' (*βλαφθεῖς κατὰ κλόνον Iliad* xvi. 331; *βλαφθεῖς ἐν ὄζῳ Iliad*. vi. 39; *βλάβεν ἄρματα καὶ ἵπῳ Iliad*. xxiii. 545); 'disable, injure'; and of the Germ. words: 'hold, guard, care for; do as a custom; hold to, associate with; bind one's self, pledge, promise, have as a duty; hinder, disable, injure, endanger.'

3. Gr. *βλέπω* 'behold, look at, look, see; guard, take care of,' *βλέπος, βλέμμα* 'look, glance,' *παραβλώψ* 'looking askance, squinting': OHG. *pflegen* 'wofür sorgen, pflegen; Aufsicht haben, behüten, beschützen' (cf. Kluge⁶, 297) is by all odds the best explanation for *βλέπω*, which in form would correspond exactly with OE. *plēon* above, root **bleq* 'hold, guard: behold, regard.'

Dor. *ποτιγλέποι* 'προσβλέποι' probably has γ from γλέφαρον 'eyelid, eye': Bulg. *globe* 'Augenhöhle' (cf. Prellwitz², 78), Gr. γλάφυ 'hollow, hole', γλάφω 'hew, carve, dig.' On the other hand *βλέφαρον* has β from *βλέπω*. The original form was perhaps *γλάφαρον.

4. Gr. *βραχύς* 'small, short, trifling, mean,' and *βραχῆων* 'arm,' probably come from **brǵh-*, **brǵh-* 'press,' in EFris. *prakken* 'pressen, drücken, kneten,' NE. *prog* 'poke, prod,' *prong* 'a sharp point or a pointed instrument, tine,' *vb.* 'stab with or as with a fork,' MLG. *prange* 'Pfahl, Stange (um zu hemmen oder zu fesseln); Maulklemme; Klemme, Einengung,' *prangen* 'jem. einengen, mit ihm ringen,' Goth. *ana-praggan* 'bedrängen,' MHG. *phrange* 'Einengung, Einschliessung,' *phrenge* 'pressen, drängen, bedrücken,' NHG. Bav. *pfreng* 'eng.' With this combination *βραχύς*, Lat. *brevis*, etc., meant 'compressed' and *βραχίων* 'a prod, prong.' Walde², 97. objects to the combination of *brevis*: Goth. *praggan* (Fick GGA., 1894, 232) without good cause.

5. Gr. *θρίδαξ* 'lettuce, *Lactuca sativa*' may be formed on a base **dhrīd-* 'sharp, pungent'; ON. *dríta* 'cacare,' Russ. dial. *dristát* 'Durchfall haben,' Slov. *dristati*, *driskati*, id. (cf. Berneker *Et. Wb.*, I, 224), root **dhrei-* 'pull, tear, split, cut': Slov. *dripati* 'zerreißen; Durchfall haben,' *dripa* 'Durchfall, besonders des Viehes,' MHG. *trīpe* 'diarrhoea'; Gr. *θρίψ* 'wood-worm,' Goth. *dreiban* 'drive' (Meringer *IF.*, XVIII, 235). For this explanation of *θρίδαξ* compare Horace *Sat.* ii. 4. 59: 'lactuca innatat acri stomacho,' and

also *ibid.* ii. 8. 7 f. From *θριδοξ*, *θριδακίνη* are derived, according to Berneker *Et. Wb.*, I, 94, Russ.-ChSl. *brūdokva*, *brēdokva* 'lettuce,' Bulg. *būrdokva* idem, Slov. *břdokva* 'salad.' If these have original *ɣ* as Berneker assumes, we may rather compare OBulg. *bridūkū* 'δριμύς,' Serb.-Cr. *břidak* 'sharp; sour,' Slov. *břidek* 'sharp, bitter,' etc.: Lat. *ferire*, *forāre* (cf. No. 13).

6. Gr. *ἵχνος* 'track, trace, footprint; trace, mark,' *ἵχνιον* 'track, trace,' *ἵχματα* *ἵχνα* Hes., which I formerly combined with *οἰχομαι*, Lith. *eigà*, 'Gang' (*Class. Phil.*, V, 305), I now compare with OBulg. *jazva* 'πληγή, ῥύπος,' Czech. *jízva* 'Narbe,' *jězvina* 'eingeritztes Zeichen; Grube, Höhle,' Russ. *jázva* 'Wunde; Geschwür,' *jázvo* 'Spitze, Stachel,' etc. (cf. Berneker *Et. Wb.*, I, 276 f.), base **aiǵh-*, *iǵh-* 'point; strike, wound, or mark with something sharp; indent, imprint,' to which may also belong Gr. *αἶχμή* 'point, spear-point, spear, arrow, javelin.' For synonymous base **aiǵx-* cf. *JEGPh.*, XIII, 499 f. For meaning compare Gr. *τύπος* 'blow; mark of a blow; impress; print, track (*στίβον*),' (cf. No. 28).

7. Gr. *καλ(φ)ός* fair, beautiful, good' is compared with Skt. *kalya-h* 'gesund; geschickt,' *kalyāna-h* 'schön, gut, trefflich, glücklich.' The former I should derive from **ql̥yo-*, the latter from **qol̥yo-*, and refer both to the root **qol̥-*, **qolā-* 'break, cut.' In that case, the primary meaning would be 'apportioned, proportioned, meet, gemäss,' whence, 'fitting, proper, suitable, fair, etc.' Compare especially Skt. *kald* 'kleiner Teil,' *kaldáyati* 'teilt zu, verteilt, ordnet an.'

With Gr. *καλός* compare also Russ. dial. *kl'wyj* (**ql̥eu-*) 'gut, passend,' Russ. *kl'ud* 'Anstand; Ordnung, Schönheit,' *kl'uzij* 'hübsch, stattlich,' Czech *kl'ud*, *klid* 'Ruhe, Frieden,' *kl'uditi*, *kliditi* 'räumen, reinigen, schlichten; sauber, nett machen,' *s-kliditi-* 'wegräumen,' *s-klidný* 'geordnet,' etc., and Goth. *hlūtrs* 'rein,' OHG. *hlūtar* 'rein' hell, lauter,' OE. *or-hlyte* 'devoid of, free from.' The combination of the Slav. and Germ. words, formerly given by Matzenauer, Zupitza, and Berneker, is now held to be incorrect by Berneker, *Et. Wb.*, I, 527.

8. Gr. *κλύω* 'dash, dash against, wash, esp. of the waves; wash off or away; wash out, drench; rub with wax' (Theocr. 1, 27), *κλύδων* 'surge, billow, wave,' *κλύδιος* 'surging, dashing,' plainly show

the meaning 'dash:wash,' not 'wash:dash.' Even so the connection with Lett. *slauzīt* 'fegen, wischen,' *slaukschēt* 'platschen, pladdern,' *slāukt* 'melken,' Lith. *szlū-ju, -ti* 'fegen, wischen' may be retained. For here also the underlying meaning is 'dash against, rub,' certainly not 'bespülen' and then 'reinigen, fegen,' as given by Walde, *Et. Wb.*², 173.

But if 'beat, dash' is the original meaning, then the Gr. words may be referred to the root **golē-, *golā-* 'beat, break, cut.' Compare especially Lett. *klaudzēt* 'anklopfen, klappern,' *klauwēt* 'anklopfen,' and No. 25.

Compare also the following, in which a similar change appears: ChSl. *kl'úkati* 'strepitare,' Russ. *klúkat* 'picheln, saufen,' *kl'učā* 'Quelle,' LRuss. *kl'úkaty* 'schlagen, vom Rieselnd und Schlagen der Adern; einen Schluck tun, sich berauschen,' Serb.-Croat. *kljūkati* 'strepitare, pulsare,' *kljūčati* 'sieden, wallen, kollern,' *kljūč* 'Hervorsprudeln, Wallen des Wassers,' Sloven. *kljūkati* 'pochen, picken,' *klákavək* 'Klopfer; Schwarzspecht': *kljwāti, kljūniti* 'picken,' LRuss. *kl'áj-derevo* 'Specht,' *kl'úkaty, kl'úpaty* 'picken.' According to Berneker, *Et. Wb.*, I, 529, 'lautnachahmend' (cf. No. 24).

9. Gr. κλόνις 'the bone at the end of the spine, os sacrum,' κλόνιον· ισχίον, ράχις, ὀσφύς Hesych: Lat. *clūnis*, etc., is a comparison that might better be discarded. The underlying meaning may be the same: 'bend, rounding out, bunch, knob, hump,' or the like. Lat. *clūnis* I refer to a base **kleu-* 'bend' (*IF.*, XVIII, 28). Similarly Gr. κλόνις may be derived from the root **qlon-* 'bend': Czech. *klon* (Biegung) 'Bug,' *kloniti* 'neigen, beugen,' OBulg. *kloniti* idem, etc. (cf. the following).

10. Gr. κλόνος 'commotion, throng and press of battle; tumult, throng,' κλονέω 'move violently, drive in confusion' are properly derived from κέλομαι, κέλλω 'drive, urge on,' Skt. *kaldyati* 'drive,' etc., root **gele-* 'push, drive.' As this may be identical with **gele-* 'bend, curve,' we may compare κλόνος with OBulg. *po-klonŭ* 'Verneigung, Anbetung,' *kloniti* 'neigen, beugen,' *po-kloniti se* 'sich neigen vor; anbeten,' *prě-kloniti* 'überbeugen,'—*se* 'sich überbeugen; wankend werden, nachgeben,' *u-kloniti* 'ablenken,' (cf. Berneker, *Et. Wb.*, I, 522).

11. Gr. κολοσυρτός 'noise, din, noisy crowd,' κολοσυρτεῖ· θορυβεῖ, ταρασσει Hesych. are not satisfactorily explained. The first part

has been compared with κολῳός 'wrangling.' This seems to be an early explanation, for it is given in Liddell-Scott's *Greek-English Lexicon*, edition of 1846. Here also κέλλω is compared, quoting Döderlein, *Lat Synonym.*, 2, p. 94, 4. This is probably correct, root *gele- 'drive, incite, shout (at), call' in Gr. βου-κόλος 'cattle-driver,' κέλομαι 'set in motion, urge on, exhort, command, call to,' κέλλω 'urge, drive on,' κέλαδος 'noise, din, noise of battle,' κλόνος 'commotion, tumult, throng of battle,' OHG. *hellan* 'ertönen,' MHG. *hellen* 'ertönen, hallen; sich rasch bewegen,' *hal-* 'Hall, Schall' (Zupitza, *Germ. Gutt.*, 118 f.): OE. *hild* 'war, battle' (*geltīa 'din, tumult'), OHG. *hiltia* 'Kampf,' etc.

The second part: -*συρτός*, -*σύρτης*, probably also meant 'commotion, din' or else 'onrush.' In either case -*συρτός* may be derived from the root *tyer- 'whirl, stir up, swing, sweep along, etc.,' in Skt. *tvāratē* 'eilt,' *tūryatē* idem, *tvārita-h*, *tūrta-h*, *tūrṇa-h*, 'eiland, schnell,' OE. *þweran* 'stir, churn; beat (metal), forge,' OHG. *dweran* 'drehen, rühren,' Skt. *turāti*, *turāyati* 'drängt vorwärts, eilt,' Gr. *σύρω* 'draw or trail along, drag by force; sweep or wash down (of rivers); sweep away (of war),' *συρτός* 'swept or washed down,' *συρμός* 'anything that draws, drags, or tears along with violence,' *σύρδην* 'rushing furiously; long-drawn out,' *σαίρω* 'sweep, sweep away,' *σύρφος*, *συρφετός* 'anything dragged or swept together, sweepings; a mixed crowd, mob, rabble,' *σύρβη*, *τύρβη* 'noise, row,' Lat. *turba*, etc. (cf. Hirt, *Idg. Abl.*, 23; Prellwitz², 442; Walde², 799). And yet Boisacq, *Dict. Ét.*, 487, cites the ancient derivation of -*συρτός* from *σύρω* as follows: '(!? Cf. Suid. s.v.).'

12. Gr. *τευθίς* 'cuttle-fish,' *τεῦθος*, *τευθός* id. are formed from *dheudh-: Skt. *dōdhat-* 'erschütternd, ungestüm, tobend,' *dudhita-h* 'verworren,' Gk. *θύσσομαι* 'shake,' *θύσανοι* 'tassels, tags, fringe, used also of the long arms of the cuttle-fish' (Brugmann, *Gdr.*, II, 104 F): LG. *dudel(ken)* 'herabhängender Flitter an Kleidungsstücken,' EFris. *bedudeln* 'wrap up,' Icel. *dúða* 'swathe in clothes,' ME. *dudde* 'a coarse cloak,' NE. *duds*, *dodder* 'shake, tremble,' *dudder* 'shiver, tremble' dial. *duddle*, 'boil, bubble,' etc. (cf. author, *MLN.*, XXII, 235).

The cuttle-fish seems here to be described as the 'flapper, fringe-fish' in reference to its arms: *θύσανοι*. Yet we might derive *τευθός* from *dheudhos 'stirred up, turbid,' in reference to the inklike fluid

ejected. This is the more usual way of describing the animal. So Gr. *σηπία* 'sepia, cuttle-fish': *σήπω* 'make rotten'; and *θόλος* 'mud, dirt' is used especially of the thick, dark juice of the cuttle-fish. Compare also OE. *wāse-scite* (mud-squirter) 'cuttle-fish.'

13. Gr. *φάρμακον* 'medicine, drug, ointment, salve, dye, paint color; enchanted potion, witchery; a stimulant to give a relish to food, a spice, seasoning,' *φαρμάσσω* 'heal by medicine; poison; enchant, bewitch; temper (metal); season, spice,' *φαρμακός* 'poisoner, magician,' etc., are combined with Lith. *būrti* 'Wahrsagerei, Kartenlegen, etc., treiben,' *burta* 'Zauberei,' *būrtas* 'Loos,' Lett. *burt* 'zaubern,' *burvis* 'Zauberer,' which may better be compared with Lat. *fors*, *fortūna*. The Greek words, however, are best derived from a base **bhr̥men-* 'something sharp or that rends, tears: drug, poison; stimulant, spice.' The use of *φαρμάσσω* 'temper (i.e., make sharp, hard); spice' indicates this primary meaning. Compare *φάρω* 'cut, sever,' Lat. *forāre*, *ferīre*, etc. (cf. Nos. 1, 5, 26).

For meaning, compare Goth. *lubja-* 'Gift, Zaubern,' ON. *lyf* 'medicine, drug,' *lyfja* 'cure, heal,' OE. *lybb* 'drug; poison,' *lybb-corn* 'purgative grain or drug,' *lybbestre* 'witch,' *lyfesn* 'a charm, amulet,' OHG. *luppi* 'Gift, Zauberei,' MHG. *luppe* 'zusammenziehender Saft; Vergiftung, Zauberei,' EFr. *lūbben* 'schinden, schädigen; kastrieren': Lith. *lūpti* 'abhäuten, schälen,' *laupyti* 'abblättern, schälen,' Goth. *laufs* 'Laub,' etc. So also OBulg. *truti* 'zehren, absumere': *traviti* 'vergiften.'

14. Gr. *χῖδρα neut. pl.* 'wheaten groats toasted' is probably from an original **χρῖδα* or **χρῖδρα*: OE. *grātan* 'groats,' **ghroidones* 'ground particles'; Gr. *κρῖθῆ* (**ghrīdhā*), 'barley-corn, barley' (*Mod. Phil.*, I, 240), base **ghrei-* 'friare.'

Or we may combine *χῖδρα* with OPruss. *gaydis* 'wheat,' which in this case must be separated from Lith. *gaidrūs* 'clear,' Gr. *φαιδρός* 'clear, bright.'

15. *Antenna, antenna* 'sail-yard' meant primarily 'end, extremity, tip': Skt. *antamāḥ* 'the last,' *āntaḥ* 'end,' Ir. *ét* 'end, point,' Goth. *andeis* 'end,' Lat. *ante*, etc. *Antenna* therefore implies an **antimus* corresponding to *intimus*, *infimus*, *postumus*. For meaning compare Gr. *τέρθρον* 'end, extremity; esp. the end or point of a sail-yard'; *κεραία* 'anything projecting like a horn: yard-arm;

antennae of a crab'; Goth. *gazds* 'Stachel,' OE. *gierd* 'rod, twig,' NE. (*sail*)-yard.

16. *Bucca* 'the (distended) cheek,' which Walde² s.v. derives 'von einem schallmalenden **bug*,' may better be explained as **bud(i)ca* and combined with *buda* 'ulva,' Gk. βύδων γὰρπον καὶ μέγα, Norw. *püte* 'cushion,' Swed. dial. *pūta* 'be puffed up,' NE. *pout*, OE. *āele-pūta* 'eel-pout,' Du. *puit* 'frog,' etc. Dial. *būfo* 'toad' belongs to the same root: OE. *puđoc* (**budh-*) 'wart, wen' ('a little swelling'), NE. *pod* 'a legume or silicle,' *poddy* 'round and stout in the belly,' MDu. *podde* (and *padde*) 'toad.'

17. *Calēre* 'be hot, warm,' *calidus* 'hot,' Lith. *szilti* 'become warm,' *szilus* 'August,' Skt. *carād-* 'Herbst,' and Lith. *szálti* 'freeze,' *száltas* 'cold' may be combined under the common meaning 'sharp, stinging': Skt. *čald-h* 'sharp point, staff, sting,' *čalyd-h*, -*m* 'spear, arrow-point, thorn, spine,' *čalam*, 'spine of the porcupine,' ON. *hali* 'sharp point, shaft, tail,' Gr. κῆλον 'shaft of an arrow, arrow,' etc., and also Lat. *culmus* (Walde², s.v.), to which may be added *culmen* 'point, tip, summit,' separating it from *columen*.

For meaning compare Russ. dial *bridkój* 'scharf; kalt,' Serb.-Cr. *bridjeti* 'brennen, jucken; schneiden (vom Winde),' Slov. *briděti* 'scharf sein, prickeln, brennen.'

18. *Calamitas* 'loss, disaster, harm; hail, blight,' so far as its meaning is concerned, may belong to No. 17. Compare Skt. *čalyd-* 'sharp point, thorn, sting; harm, failure,' Gr. κῆλον 'shaft, bolt,' in Hom. of Apollo's arrows bringing pestilence or of the thunderbolts of Zeus.

19. *Culina* 'kitchen' may be referred to Skt. *kūlayati* 'versengt,' Lett. *kwēlēt*, *kweldēt* 'glimmen, glühen, brennenden Schmerz verursachen,' *kulda* 'der Vorofen, in welchem die Kohlen zusammen-geschürt werden,' etc.

20. *Cēra* 'wax' (**qērā*), Gr. κηρός 'wax, cera,' κηρίον 'honeycomb, favus': Lith. *korj̃s* idem, Lett. *kārītes* 'Bienenzellen mit Honig' (cf. Walde², 152 f.) have the gradation ē:ō. Exactly the same gradation occurs in the root **qēr-*, *qōr-* 'cut, indent, scratch, notch,' to which *cēra*, *κηρός*, etc., evidently belong as descriptive terms of the striated surface of the honeycomb. Compare Upper Sorb. *čara* (**qērā*) 'Strich, Linie; Furche; Durchhau, Wildbahn im

Walde,' Czech *čara* 'Linie,' *čarati* 'Linien ziehen': Lat. *cēra* 'wax,' *sin-cērus* (without scratch, unscathed, unblemished) 'integer, uninjured, whole, entire; uncorrupted, sound, pure'; and with o Russ. *korī* 'die Masern,' Lith. *karai* 'Steinpocken; rötlich blaue Flecken am Körper beim Typhus,' *pra-karūs* 'maserig vom Holz': Gr. *κηρίον* 'honey-comb; a cutaneous disease,' *μελικηρίς* 'honey-comb; a virulent eruption on the head.'

With these compare **qars-* in Lat. *carrere* 'card (wool),' Skt. *kāṣṭi* 'reibt, schabt, kratzt,' Lith. *kaṣzti* 'kämmen, krämpeln,' OBulg. *krasta* 'στίγμα, scabies,' etc.

21. *Calā-re*, *clāmāre*, etc., if they belong together, probably contain a root **qolā-* 'crash, clash,' identical with **qolā-* 'break.' This root became confused with a root **gel-* 'drive, incite': Gr. *καλλω* 'urge, drive on,' *καλομαι* 'urge on, exhort, command; call, call to,' Skt. *kalāyati* 'treibt, hält, trägt,' etc. These two roots gave rise to a large number of onomatopoetic formations.

22. *Clārus* 'clear, bright; distinct, loud; manifest, intelligible; illustrious' has long been referred to the root in *calā-re*, *clāmāre* with a comparison with MHG. *hel(l)* 'lauttönend; hell, glänzend.' In spite of this alluring comparison, I think it more probable that the primary meaning of *clārus* was 'separate, distinct,' and then 'distinct' in various senses. Compare OIr. *clár* 'Tafel, Brett,' Welsh *clawr* idem, Gr. *κληρος* 'lot': **qlāro-s* 'separated, cut off, distinct, *clārus*'; 'something cut or split off, tablet, Ir. *clár*'; 'piece of wood used in casting lots, lot, *κληρος*,' root **qolā-*, **qlā-* 'break, cut, separate': Lat. *clā-dēs*, Gr. *κλάω* 'break off, prune,' OBulg. *klati* 'stechen, schlachten,' Russ. *kolót* 'stechen, schlachten; spalten; hacken,' etc.

23. *Classis* is also referred to *calāre*, etc., as if the primary meaning were 'a group called together.' In place of this combination Stowasser, *Lat.-dt. Wb.*, explains *classis* as meaning primarily 'Abteilung, Abschnitt,' comparing Gr. *κλάω*, etc. To this Walde, *Et. Wb.*,² 167, objects: "doch zeigt diese [Sippe] im Lat. sonst durchaus den Begriff des 'Schlagens,' nicht des 'Schneidens.'"

This is begging the question. But even if it were true, that would be no valid objection to Stowasser's explanation. We may

therefore proceed on the assumption that *classis* may primarily have meant 'section, division,' root **qolā-* 'break, cut.'

In that case *classis* is from **qlad-tis* or **qlat-tis*. If with *d*, then we may compare Gr. κλάδος 'branch, shoot,' κλαδάω, -δεύω 'lop off, prune,' Lat. *clādēs*, which meant 'cutting off, down' as much as 'beating, Schlagen' (compare especially: "Mucius cui postea Scaevolae a *clade* dextrae manus cognomen inditum"). If with *t*, compare Gr. κλάσις 'a breaking, fracture; a breaking off, pruning, plucking': OE. *hlōþ* (**qlātā-*) 'booty, spoil; band of brigands or pirates; troop, multitude,' OLFranc. *hlōtha* 'praeda,' MHG. *luot* 'gewaltsamer nächtlicher Raub; Rotte, Schar.'

24. *Calvus* 'without hair, bald,' Skt. *-kulva-h*, *-kūrva-h*, 'bald,' etc. (cf. Walde², 116 f.) may easily be combined with Skt. *kūṭah*, if this is from **qītōs*, from the common meaning 'shorn, clipped, docked,' not from 'Hervorragendes, etc.,' as given by von Bradke, KZ., XXXIV, 158. Compare especially Gr. κόλος 'docked, clipped, stunted; stump-horned, hornless,' κολάζω 'curtail, dock, prune; check, punish,' κολούω 'dock, clip,' ChSl. *kl'uju*, *kl'ivati* 'picken,' Russ. *klevdt'* 'picken, hacken, rupfen,' *klevókū* 'Stoss, Schlag, Stich,' etc. This group is, according to Berneker, *Et. Wb.*, I, 528, 'ohne sichere Beziehungen.'

25. *Cluo* 'purgo' may or may not be related to *cloāca*. In any case it is more probable that *cluere* meant primarily 'cut, separate, putare,' not 'wash.' Compare especially ChSl. *kl'ivati* 'picken' Russ. *klevdt'* 'hacken, rupfen,' Gr. κολούω 'dock, clip,' etc. (No. 24).

With this explanation we may more easily connect Welsh *clir* (**qlūros*) 'hell, klar, heiter, rein' than from the meaning 'washed, rinsed.' For meaning, cf. No. 22.

26. *Fastidium* 'loathing, disgust' as well as *fastigium* 'point, summit, gable' may be combined with Skt. *bhr̥ṣṭīh* 'Spitze, Zacke, Kante, Gipfel,' etc. For meaning compare the base **bhrid-* 'cutting, sharp' in OBulg. *bridūkū* 'δριμύς,' Russ.-ChSl. *bridoslī* 'Schärfe, Bitterkeit,' LRuss. *brydkýj* 'garstig, hässlich, abscheulich,' ó-bryd 'Ekel, Abscheu.'

27. *Focus* 'fire-place, hearth' is probably from **dhyogōs*: Lith. *dvdkas* 'Hauch, Atem,' *dvakoti* 'keuchend atmen,' *dvekoti* 'atmen,

keuchen,' *duksē'ti* idem, Skt. *dhukṣatē* with *sam-* 'facht an, zündet an, belebt,' etc. (cf. Persson *Beitr.* 653⁹).

28. *Ignia* 'vitia vasorum fictilium,' may be a genuine Lat. word, **ighniā* 'cracks, marks, blemishes': Gr. *ἰγνία* 'tracks,' Lith. *ižti* 'entzweigehen,' *ižines* 'Schrauben,' Lett. *vej-ife* 'Windriss im Holz,' *aifa* 'Spalte im Eise,' etc. (cf. No. 6).

29. *Lupa* 'meretrix,' which I formerly compared with MHG. *sluwe* 'gemeines Weib, meretrix,' NE. *sloven*, etc. (*Class. Phil.*, VII, 113), I now think is from a **lupā* 'skin; hull,' with which compare *lupinus*, -um (having a hull or pod) 'lupine': Lith. *lūpti* 'schälen, abhäuten,' *lupinat* 'die abgeschälte Schale von Obst und dergl.,' Goth. *laufs* 'Laub,' LRuss. *lūpa*, Schale, Hülse, Haut, etc. For meaning compare Lat. *scortum* 'hide; harlot'; Lett. *skura* 'Hülse, Schale, Hülle, Haut:Hure.'

30. *Peccāre* 'fail, commit a fault, sin,' *peccans* 'offender, sinner,' *peccantius* 'more faulty, worse' may be derived from **ped(i)cā-*, -co- 'falling, fallen, low': *pejor* (**pedjōs*, cf. Walde² s.v.) 'worse,' *pessimus* 'worst.' These are from the root **ped-* in the sense 'fall, be low': Skt. *pādyaṭē* 'fall, collapse, perish; go to,' *pādāyati* 'fell' (**pōd-*), OBulg. *padq* (**pōd-*) 'fall,' OE. *fetan* 'fall,' Gr. *πέδον* 'ground, earth,' *πεδῖον* '(low) flat country, plain,' *πεδικός* 'of a plain' (:Lat. **pedico*- 'low'), *πέζα* 'foot, lower part of anything,' *πεζός* 'on foot; pedestris, humilis; prosaic; low, not lofty (of comic poetry); low, common (courtesan),' etc.

31. *Petimen* 'a sore on the shoulder of the beasts of burden or draft' is separated by Persson *IF*, XXVI, 66, from *petimen* 'breast,' Lith. *petys* 'shoulder.' The words are related to each other as Lat. *mentigo* 'scab on the mouth or snout of sheep': *mentum* 'chin'; *ostigo* 'mentigo': *ostium* (in the sense of 'mouth') 'mouth of a river; door,' OBulg. *usta* 'mouth,' or *ostigo* from Lat. *ōs*+*-tigo* from *mentigo*. To *petimen* belongs *petigo* 'scab' with the meaning generalized.

32. *Torus* 'a twist or strand of rope; brawn, muscle; cushion, bed' and *teres* 'tightly twisted, firmly woven; curling; well-turned, round; elegant' are from the root **ter* in the sense 'turn, twist; turn in a lathe'; not 'rub.' Compare Gr. *τόρπος* 'a carpenter's tool for drawing a circle; a turner's chisel; a circle, round,' *τορπώω*

'make round; round or smooth off,' *τορνεύω* 'work with a lathe, round; round off (verses); twist round,' *τορεύω* 'work figures by beating the metal into rounded prominences, work in relief,' *τόρευμα* 'embossed work; a wheeling round.'

33. *Silex* 'any hard stone in the fields, pebble, flint,' *siliqua* 'a kind of very white wheat, *Triticum hiemale*,' *siliqua* 'pod, husk,' *silicia* 'fenugreek' may all be referred to a base **psil-* 'rub, crush; peel, strip': Gr. *ψιλος* 'rubbed bare, stript,' *ψιλον* 'feather,' *ψίω* 'rub to pieces,' *ψίξ* 'crumb, morsel,' *ψιάς* 'drop,' *ψήν* 'rub, rub away,' *ψήφος*, 'pebble,' *ψήχω* 'rub down; grind down,' *ψήγμα* 'what is rubbed or scraped off' (so *siliqua*: *ψιλον* 'feather'), etc.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

A NOTE ON THE *LEXICON MILITARE*

The so-called *Lexicon Militare* is best known because frequently printed as an appendix to editions of Suidas. It dates from the period between Hadrian and the Byzantine era, of which it shows not a trace. The best edition is that in Köchly and Rüstow: *Griechische Kriegsschriftsteller* (Leipzig, 1855), II, 2, based upon the ninth- or tenth-century MS Coislin. 347, as published by Montfaucon: *Bibl. Coislin.*, pp. 505-13 (Omont: *Invent. Somm.*, III, 187).¹

Köchly and Rüstow in the *Erste Abteilung, Einleitung*, p. 100, speak of the *Lexicon Militare* and Psellus' *περὶ πολεμικῆς τάξεως* as "fast wörtliche Excerpte aus Aelianus,"² and again, *Zweite Abteilung, Anhang II*, p. 218, they call Aelian "die fast alleinige Quelle des Glossariums" (meaning the *Lexicon Militare*). There is no doubt that a large part of the *Lexicon Militare* was taken directly from Aelian, but a great deal also comes from Arrian, and there is besides a third important source, Asclepiodotus (first published in the *Griechische Kriegsschriftsteller*, Vol. I), whom Köchly and Rüstow mention only once or twice, and then only in the critical apparatus, but who is clearly entitled to much more consideration. From numerous examples I shall quote but two as specimens, the first where Aelian and Arrian have nothing at all to correspond, the second where the same subject-matter indeed appears, but the *Lexicon Militare* is clearly following the form of expression used by Asclepiodotus.

<i>Lexicon Militare</i>	Asclepiodotus	Aelian and Arrian ³
§ 14. Ἑκτακοί. τούτους τὸ μὲν παλαιὸν ἡ τάξις εἶχεν, ὡς καὶ τοῦνομα δηλοῖ, διότι τῆς τάξεως ἐξάριθμοι ἦσαν.	II, 9. Τοὺς δὲ ἐκτάκτους τὸ μὲν παλαιὸν ἡ τάξις εἶχεν, ὡς καὶ τοῦνομα σημαίνει, δι' ὅτι (διότι the archetype, <i>Cod. Med.</i> LV. 4) τῆς τάξεως ἐξάριθμοι ὑπῆρχον, κτλ.	(Nothing to correspond.)

¹ The work begins on f. 168r. Its full title here is "Ὅσαι ὀνομασίαι ἀρχῶν τε, τάξεων καὶ πλήθους τῶν ἐν ταῖς πολεμικαῖς παρασκευαῖς καὶ χρεαίαις. Very different is the title in the MSS and editions of Suidas, as well as that used for the edition printed as an appendix to Thomas Magister, *Lutetiae*, 1542. It is clear that the original title was lost at an early date, so that the convenient designation *Lexicon Militare* will do as well as any other.

² Köchly believed that "Aelian" was merely an interpolated version of "Arrian," and that neither work was written by the author whose name it bears, but the view is untenable, and Arrian deserves to be considered a source quite as much as Aelian.

³ For convenience' sake references to Arrian are given according to the chapter and paragraph numbering in Köchly and Rüstow, where Arrian and Aelian appear in parallel columns. The text in every instance has been compared with that of Hercher—Eberhard, Leipzig, 1885.

Lexicon Militare

§ 40. Διπλασιάσαι διχῶς λέγεται· ἡ γὰρ τόπον, ἐν ᾧ ἡ φάλαγξ, μένοντος τοῦ πλήθους τῶν ἀνδρῶν, ἡ ἀριθμὸν αὐτῶν. γίνεται δὲ ἐκάτερον διχῶς, ἡ κατὰ λόχον ἡ κατὰ ζυγά, ταῦτον δ' εἰπεῖν κατὰ μήκος ἡ κατὰ βάθος· κτλ.

Asclepiodotus

X, 17. Διπλασιάσαι δὲ λέγεται διχῶς· ἡ γὰρ τόπον, ἐν ᾧ ἡ φάλαγξ, μένοντος τοῦ πλήθους τῶν ἀνδρῶν, ἡ τὸν ἀριθμὸν αὐτῶν· γίνεται δὲ ἐκάτερον διχῶς, κατὰ λόχον ἡ κατὰ ζυγόν, ταῦτον δὲ εἰπεῖν κατὰ βάθος ἡ κατὰ μήκος.

Aelian

XXIX, 1, 2.

Διπλασιασμῶν δὲ ἐστὶ γένη δύο, ἥτοι κατὰ ζυγά ἡ κατὰ βάθος. τοῦτων δὲ ἕκαστον ἡ τῷ ἀριθμῷ διπλασιάζεται ἡ τῷ τόπῳ· ἀριθμῷ μὲν γὰρ διπλασιάζεται τὸ μήκος, ἐὰν ἀντὶ αὐτοῦ βῆμι ποιῆσαι βουλώμεθα, κτλ.

Arrian

XXIX, 1, 2.

Διπλασιασμῶν δὲ δισὰ γένη τυγχάνει δυνάμεις, ἥτοι κατὰ ζυγά ἡ κατὰ βάθος. καὶ τοῦτων ἕκαστον ἡ τῷ ἀριθμῷ διπλασιάζεται ἡ τῷ τόπῳ. ἀριθμῷ μὲν, εἰ ἀντὶ χιλίων εἰκοσι τεσσάρων τὸ μήκος διαχιλίων τεσσαράκοντα ὀκτὼ ποιήσαιμεν, κτλ.

Other especially noteworthy instances where Asclepiodotus is copied verbatim or nearly so are paragraphs 28, 29, and 59, which are taken from VI, 1, and XI, 7.

A few instances will also show that Arrian's form of statement is at times preferred to that of Aelian. Thus:

Lexicon Militare

§ 36. Ἀναστροφή ἐστὶν ἡ ἀποκατάστασις τῆς ἐπιστροφῆς εἰς τὴν προτέραν χώραν.

Arrian

XXV, 7. Ἀναστροφή δὲ ἐστὶν ἡ ἀποκατάστασις τῆς ἐπιστροφῆς εἰς τὴν προτέραν χώραν.

Aelian

XXV, 7. Ἀναστροφή δὲ ἐστὶν ἀποκατάστασις ἐπιστροφῆς εἰς τὴν προκατεῖχε τὸ σύνταγμα τόπον περικυκλωμένον πρὸ τοῦ γενέσθαι αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐπιστροφήν.

§ 45. Πρόσταξις δὲ, ὅταν ἐξ ἐκατέρων τῶν μερῶν τῆς τάξεως ἡ ἐκ θατέρου κατὰ τὸ κέρας αὐτὸ προστεθῇ τι στῖφος τῇ πάσῃ φάλαγγι κατ' εὐθὺ τοῦ μετώπου τῆς τάξεως.

XXXI, 2. Πρόσταξις δὲ, ὅταν ἡ ἐξ ἐκατέρων τῶν μερῶν τῆς τάξεως ἡ ἐκ θατέρου κατὰ τὸ κέρας αὐτὸ προστεθῇ τι στῖφος τῇ πάσῃ φάλαγγι κατ' εὐθὺ τοῦ μετώπου τῆς τάξεως.

XXXI, 2. Πρόσταξις δὲ ἐστὶν, ὅταν ἐξ ἐκατέρων τῶν μερῶν τῆς τάξεως ἡ ἐκ τοῦ ἐνὸς προστεθῇ τι μέρος κατὰ κέρας πρὸς τὴν αὐτὴν τῇ φάλαγγι ἐπιφάνειαν.

§ 49. Ἀμφίστομος φάλαγξ καλεῖται ἡ τοὺς ἡμισείας τῶν ἐν τοῖς λόχοις ἀνδρῶν ἀπεστραμμένους ἀπὸ σφῶν ἔχουσα, ὡς ἀντινώτους εἶναι.

XXXVII, 1. Ἐτι δὲ ἀμφίστομος μὲν φάλαγξ καλεῖται ἡ τοὺς ἡμισείας τῶν ἐν τοῖς λόχοις ἀνδρῶν ἀπεστραμμένους, ἀπὸ σφῶν ἔχουσα, ὡς ἀντινώτους εἶναι.

XXXVII, 1. Ἀμφίστομος μὲν οὖν φάλαγξ καλεῖται ἡ τοὺς ἡμισείας τῶν ἐν τοῖς λόχοις ἀνδρῶν ἔχουσα ἀντινώτους ἀντινώτους τεταγμένους.

Other clear cases where Arrian is the source followed are paragraphs 35 and 52-56, corresponding to XXIII, 5, and XXXVII, 5-9 respectively.

Thus the *Lexicon Militare* instead of being derived almost exclusively from a single source, Aelian, is a compilation of three principal sources, Aelian (for the most part), Arrian, and Asclepiodotus, and a minor one, now apparently lost.¹ Its value lies in the fact that, as it was so often copied verbatim from its sources, it may frequently serve as a control upon the MSS tradition. In Asclepiodotus, for example, it confirms necessary emendations in the great Florentine MS of the Greek military writers, LV, 4, in a score of places, and supports suggestions of Köchly in one or two other passages. The same will probably be found to be true in the case of Arrian and Aelian likewise, but to determine that will require a separate investigation.

W. A. OLDFATHER
J. B. TITCHENER

THE UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

NOTE ON THE REPEATED SIMILE, HOMER *ILIAD* xi. 555
and xvii. 664

The higher criticism of Homer is protected by its own smoke. It is probable that not ten living men have examined critically any one of the dozen or more volumes that "analyze" the plot of the *Iliad*. And a thorough review of any one of these volumes that exposed all its errors would be left unread. But the presentation of a typical example now and then may help to open the eyes of students. A very few minutes of attention will suffice for the following. Professor Wilamowitz (*Die Ilias und Homer*, p. 150) is arguing that the lion simile in *Iliad*. xvii 657-67 is an inept interpolation from xi. 550 ff. Others, of course, have maintained that book xi is the degenerate copy. With that I am not concerned, but with the light which the discussion casts on the whole method. In the course of his argument he contrives to misinterpret both passages. In xi. 555 the poet says that as the baffled lion departed

τετιγότι θυμῶν·
ὥς Αἴας τὸτ' ἀπὸ Τρώων τετιγμένος ἦτορ
ἦμ, πόλλ' δέκων· περὶ γὰρ διέ νηυσὶν Ἀχαιῶν.

This, of course, means that Ajax retired troubled and unwilling because every such retreat brought the Trojans nearer to the ships. Throughout the *Iliad* the falling of the Greeks or the Trojans upon the ships is the symbol of Greek defeat. The γάρ then justifies the "unwilling" and the "troubled

¹ To which are to be referred such passages as §§ 6 (end), 12 (beg.), 14 (end), 15 (beg.), 17 (mid.), 20 (beg.), 22 (end), 23 (end), 38 (end), 57 (end), which have no counterpart in the three tacticians named. These additions appear to have no great value.

at heart" which contain the point of the comparison. Professor Wilamowitz misapprehending the reference of γάρ says that the meaning is that Ajax though unwilling did retire, for he knew that this was the right way to defend the ships for which he feared. That is quite impossible. There is no suggestion of any such strategy on the part of Ajax and it cannot be read into line 569.

πάντας δὲ προέεργε θοῶς ἐπὶ νῆας ὀδεύειν

Which merely says that in his retreat and his rallies he tried to prevent the Trojans from making their way to the ships. He has been turned to flight against his will by Zeus (l. 544). There is no question as yet of actual fighting at the ships. The Trojans do not break through the wall till the end of the next book.

In the second passage the same simile is applied to Menelaus retiring unwillingly from the body of Patroclus xvii. 665-67

ὥς ἀπὸ Πατρόκλοιο βοῆν ἀγαθὸς Μενέλαος
ἦε πόλλ' ἀέκων· περὶ γὰρ διέ μή μιν Ἀχαιοὶ
ἀργαλέον πρὸ φόβου ἔλωρ δηϊοῖσι λίποιεν.

Here again γάρ refers to the point of the simile contained in τετιηότι θυμῷ used of the lion and πόλλ' ἀέκων, here its virtual equivalent, used of Menelaus. The only difference is that here πόλλ' ἀέκων is not reinforced by the repetition τετιημένος ἦτορ. Not perceiving this Professor Wilamowitz argues that it is only the constraint of the interpolated simile that prevents the poet from telling us with γάρ why in spite of his unwillingness Menelaus left his place. But we have already learned that from Ajax' request that Menelaus should find Antilochus and dispatch him to Achilles. His unwillingness and his exhortation to remember the gentle kindness of Patroclus are due to the fear that in his absence the Greeks will abandon the body to the Trojans.

The new scholasticism of the higher criticism seems to render its addicts blind both to the niceties of Homeric usage and to the reasonable implications of the context of the passages which it tortures on the rack of "analysis."

PAUL SHOREY

TWO SOPHOCLEAN CRUXES

Antigone 4:

οὐδὲν γὰρ οὐτ' ἀλγεὺν οὐτ' ἄτης ἄτερ
οὐτ' αἰσχρὸν οὐτ' ἄτιμόν ἐσθ', ὅποῖον οὐ
τῶν σῶν τε κἄμῶν οὐκ ὅπωπ' ἐγὼ κακῶν.

That ἄτης ἄτερ, though read even before Didymus, is a corrupt reading, appears to admit of no argument. The passage, however, despite the numberless conjectures proposed, seems to be considered hopeless. No doubt

every ambitious scholar has tried his hand at it, and I hesitate to calculate how many suggestions I have myself made or entertained. Among them I have worked over the glosses of Hesychius: AAATON· τὸ ἀβλαβὲς καὶ εὐχερές, ἢ ἀνευ ἄτης, ἢ ἀπλήρωτον. AATON· ἐπιβλαβές, ἢ ἀνευ ἄτης ἢ ἀπλήρωτον. AATOS (obviously AATOS)· χαλεπός, δυσχερής· ἀκόρεστος, ἀχόρταστος. For, assuming that Sophocles wrote ἀάατον, ἄτης ἄτερ might be taken as an explanatory gloss which had crept into the text. This suggestion, however alluring, I was led to abandon because of certain passages which seemed to me to offer a simpler and more satisfactory solution; for ἄτης was both intelligible and natural, and ἄτερ alone was unacceptable.

For the thought and the sequence of concepts one naturally compares: *Oed. Tyr.* 1283:

νῦν δὲ τῇδε θήμερα
στεναγμός, ἄτη, θάνατος, αἰσχύνῃ, κακῶν
ὅσ' ἐστὶ πάντων ὀνόματ', οὐδὲν ἐστ' ἀπόν.

This passage, long noted by me as evidence for the soundness of the MS tradition as regards ἄτης, and affording a striking parallel to ἀλγεινόν, ἄτη, αἰσχρόν, ἄτιμον, suggests no remedy for ἄτερ. Two other passages, however, which I chanced to read the same day, gave the hint that has approved itself to my judgment for at least ten years, to wit:

Eurip. *Hec.* 714:

ἄρρητ' ἄνωμόματα, θαυμάτων πέρα,
οὐχ ὅσι' οὐδ' ἀνεκτά

and Pausanias iv. 5. 6: αἱ δὲ γινώμαι διάφοροι παρὰ πολὺ ἐγίνοντο, Ἄνδροκλέους μὲν ἐκδιδόναι Πολυχάρην ὡς ἀνόσια τε καὶ πέρα δεινῶν εἰργασμένον κτλ. For in these texts, in tenor not unlike the Sophoclean crux with which we are concerned, πέρα with a noun in the genitive is closely linked with one or more adjectives to form an impressive and emphatic whole. I assume, then, that Sophocles wrote ἄτης πέρα. But something remains to be said about the phrase. It is to be noted that besides the form just illustrated examples not a few occur in which πέρα is used adverbially, following an adjective and preceded by καί; as

Eurip. *Elect.* 1187: ἅλαστα μέλεια καὶ πέρα
παθοῦσα σὼν τέκνων ὑπαί.

Soph. *fr.* 189 Pearson: ὦ πᾶν σὺν τολμήσασα καὶ πέρα γυνή.

Arist. *Thesmoph.* 705: ταῦτα δῆτ' οὐ δέονα πράγματ' ἐστὶ καὶ περαιτέρω;

Arist. *An.* 418: ἄπιστα καὶ πέρα κλύειν.

Here the addition of καὶ πέρα has clearly the force of 'nay, more,' as is shown by the phrase δεινὸν καὶ πέρα δεινοῦ (*Demos.* 45, 73; cf. *Dionys. Halic. A.R.* 11. 39.) Nor can one doubt that θαυμάτων πέρα and πέρα δεινῶν are shorthand for θαυμάσια καὶ πέρα θαυμάτων and δεινὰ καὶ πέρα δεινῶν: in

like manner *ἀτης πέρα* would be equivalent to *ἀτηρὸν καὶ ἀτης πέρα*. One might, then, render Sophocles thus, reading *ἀτης πέρα*,

There is no pain, nor confusion worse confounded,
No scandal nor dishonor, yours and mine,
But these my eyes have seen it all fulfilled.

Pearson, commenting on *Soph. fr.* 189, calls this 'a frigid hyperbole': be that as it may, it was obviously in rather common use, and Sophocles resorted elsewhere to hyperbolic statements not essentially different, as when he said

Antig. 1281: τί δ'; ἔστιν αὖ κακίον ἢ κακῶν ἔτι;
Oed. Tyr. 1365: εἰ δέ τι πρεσβύτερον ἔτι κακοῦ κακόν,
τοῦτ' ἔλαχ' Οἰδίπους.

These considerations led me to adopt the reading *ἀτης πέρα*, believing that *ἀτερ* was an early (and easily explained) corruption of *πέρα*. Finding the same conjecture credited to Wecklein, I took occasion to consult his *Ars Soph. Emendandi*, page 79, only to discover that he offered nothing to commend it but the statement, "Corruptum autem *ἀτερ* propter *ἀτης* ex *πέρα*. Cum verbis οὐδὲν γὰρ . . . *ἀτης πέρα* cf. locutionem *δεινὸν καὶ πέρα δεινοῦ*."

Oed. Tyr. 44: ὥς τοῖσιν ἐμπειροῖσι καὶ τὰς συμφορὰς
ζώσας ὁρῶ μάλιστα τῶν βουλευμάτων.

Here again, as the presumably old scholium shows, the MS tradition goes back to ancient sources. Though the passage is not so obviously corrupt as that which we have just considered, because a tolerable sense may be extracted from it by dint of the sort of violence of faith which the Kingdom of Heaven suffereth. The critical reader who peruses the scholium or the tortuous brief for the defense written by Jebb may well remain unconvinced. Only too plainly these advocates are making the best of a bad case. Jebb renders: "for I see that, when men have been proved in deeds past, the issues of their counsels, too, most often have effect." To take τῶν βουλευμάτων with τὰς συμφορὰς is difficult; to understand τὰς συμφορὰς as "issues" is in the context next to impossible. Moreover, the meaning which has been given and must be given to ζώσας, if retained, is, though possible, not quite what the situation demands. With a sure instinct, various scholars have pitched upon ζώσας as the seat of the difficulty, requiring a substantive in its stead. One cannot doubt that if a satisfactory emendation had been offered, it would have been accepted in spite of all that has been said, or might be said, in favor of the traditional text. Musgrave suggested δμώας or θήσας; Mekler, ῥύζας. Apart from other obvious objections, these would-be substitutes for ζώσας are alike unsatisfactory, because they depart too widely from the reading of the MSS.

I would propose ζώσ<τρ>ας. The word ζώστρα does not occur in the lexica; but ζώστρον does. Moreover, Sophocles (fr. 342 Pearson) used ἐπιζώστρα, and ἀναζώστρα, διαζώστρα and περιζώστρα were employed by other Greek writers. "To gird one's self" for a fray or for a journey must have been a common thought with the Greeks, since it was the common practice, except that in athletic contests the διάζωμα was in later times omitted. The fact that the expression does not, apparently, occur in classical Greek in a metaphorical application can under the circumstances signify nothing. In later Greek we find ζώνη τροπικῶς ἢ δύναμις, ἐπειδὴ ὁ ἐξωσμένος εὐσταπώτερός ἐστι πρὸς τὴν πρᾶξιν (Theodoret in *Psalm.* apud Suidam), and one cannot doubt that so obvious a figure must have been long familiar. One has only to think of the metaphorical uses of συντρένω and its occasional connection with ζώνη, as e.g. in Eurip. *Iph. Taur.* 203 sq., where the Moirai, as birth-goddesses, are clearly functional equivalents of Athena ζώστρα or ζώστρηα, to make sure that the thought was familiar to the Greeks of the fifth century. Plato could make Socrates bid the scatter-brained Euthyphro ξύνταε σαντόν (*Euth.* 12A); and what was more natural than to bid a man to brace himself when about to be put to the test in a trial of waist of strength? For the situation one may compare Terence *Phorm.* 315 sq., where at the crisis the parasite says to himself,

Ad te summa solum, Phormio, rerum redit:
tute hoc intristi: tibi omnest exedendum: accingere.

He is not proposing to brace himself for a physical encounter with the irate father, but trying to collect his wits and use them to the best purpose. One would wish to know just what stood here in the Greek original of Apollodorus: not knowing, it is useless perhaps to speculate. But it will suffice to draw the parallel. As Phormio exhorts himself to brace up and bethink himself of some expedient in the difficult situation that confronts him, we may well conceive of the priest of Zeus as politely suggesting the same course to Oedipus,

To men approved, I find, e'en dire disaster
Doth chiefly serve to brace their wits for counsel.

For necessity is the mother of invention.

The quotation from Theodoret suggests another possibility. Supposing the corruption in ζώσας to date, as it may, from the fifth (or early fourth) century, it may be worth considering whether Sophocles did not write ζώνας rather than ζώστας; for early Attic inscriptions (cf. Roberts, *Introd. to Gr. Epigr.*, pp. 384 sq.) show forms of sigma and nu distinguished solely by the slant of the nu. For the sigma compare the βόστρυχος εἰλιγμένος of Eurip. fr. 382. 7. The corruption is therefore not difficult to explain. The interpretation would be the same whether we read ζώνας or ζώστας.

W. A. HEIDEL

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY

SCELERATUM FRIGUS

In Virgil's *Georgics*, ii. 256 occurs the phrase: *sceleratum exquirere frigus*. The use of the adjective has attracted the attention of commentators from Servius on, and various supposed parallels have been adduced without bringing much additional light to the passage. There has been pretty generally overlooked, however, a discussion by Saint Jerome (*Ep.* 121. 10, p. 879 Vall.), where, speaking of certain Cilician provincialisms in the language of Saint Paul, he remarks: *nec hoc miremur in apostolo si utatur eius linguae consuetudine in qua natus est et nutritus, cum Virgilius, alter Homerus apud nos, patriae suae sequens consuetudinem, sceleratum frigus appellet*. Doubtless this criticism is borrowed by Jerome from his teacher Donatus (cf. Lammert, *De Hieronymo Donati Discipulo* [1912], pp. 38-39). Did the Patavinity of Livy perhaps consist in as slight but yet definite features as this by which Virgil betrayed his native district?

ARTHUR STANLEY PEASE

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

BOOK REVIEWS

Martial, the Epigrammatist; and Other Essays. By KIRBY FLOWER SMITH. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1920. 171 pp. \$2.00.

In this volume Professor Wilfred Mustard has collected a number of papers written by his friend and colleague, Kirby Smith, late professor of Latin in the Johns Hopkins University. Besides the essay which gives its title to the book there are chapters on "The Poet Ovid," "Propertius; A Modern Lover in the Augustan Age," and also in a different vein "Pupula Duplex." The other papers are of a wholly different type: "The Classics and Our Vernacular," "The Future Place of the Humanities in Education," and "Some Boyhood Reminiscences of a Country Town." At the end of the volume are given some of Professor Smith's metrical translations and original verse.

The collection comprises only some of the less technical of Professor Smith's writings, but the choice of material made by the editor within these limits is notably felicitous; it exemplifies both the author's special interests and the range of his erudition. In the essays on Martial, Propertius, and Ovid we see his love of literature for its own sake, his subtle appreciation of its various forms and that gift of analysis which brings home to the reader—as it did in the old days to his students at Johns Hopkins—all those qualities of the poets, whether emotional or technical, which made their poems what they were. Many writers of "essays of appreciation" have but a superficial knowledge of their subject, but these essays by Professor Smith are based upon an exhaustive study of the poets and an unrivaled command of the literature of the departments to which they belonged. After reading them one knows Martial, Propertius, and Ovid as never before.

While Graeco-Roman elegy constituted Professor Smith's chief interest, he had a distinct bent for the study of folk-lore, and this side of his mind is illustrated by the article on the *pupula duplex*. Here we see his erudition, his familiarity with authors obscure and little read, his love of the curious in custom and literature, and his skill in interpretation.

In the papers "The Classics and Our Vernacular" and "The Future Place of the Humanities in Education" we see our author as an apologist for classical culture. To me, and, I think, to many of his students and colleagues, this is his most unfamiliar rôle. He loved the classics so dearly, he believed so thoroughly in their educational value, that a formal defense of them must always have seemed to him a superfluity and a bore. But

secretaries of associations must have papers for their meetings and Kirby Smith was always ready to help. The essays, moreover, are good, and it is characteristic of him that in the first of them instead of repeating all the time-worn arguments, so old, so tattered, and so frayed, he selects a single one, the value of the classics for the study of English and the development of an English style, and elaborates it in a way that is at once genial and vigorous, persuasive and effective. In the "Humanities in Education," among other good points, he draws attention to the character of German education in the period before August, 1914:

Now it is safe to say that for more than a generation the most obvious and striking characteristic of German education was that, apart from being highly organized and relentlessly thorough, it has been more exclusively scientific and technical than any system of education has ever been in any part of the world. Not content with its own proper domain, science and the scientific attitude had sought and found a "place in the sun" in practically every department of human activity. The Humanities undertook to save themselves by protective assimilation; but the final result of the effort was that at the outbreak of the war there was hardly a handful of classical scholars subject to the draft who could ever hope to command or deserve the recognition given to their illustrious predecessors.

G. J. LAING

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Livy. With an English translation by B. O. FOSTER. Volume I. Books I and II. ("Loeb Classical Series.") London: William Heinemann; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1919. xxxvi+447. 2 maps. \$2.25.

The excellent quality of this first instalment of Professor Foster's proposed thirteen-volume translation of *Livy* assures us of at last having a good rendering of all that remains of the historian's work. The only complete translations now available (Holland's, London, 1600, and Baker's 1797) are old fashioned in vocabulary and style, and in other respects also are far from satisfactory.

Professor Foster has equipped his work with a much more substantial introduction than is to be found in other recently published volumes of the Loeb series. In it he discusses most of the outstanding questions connected with *Livy*: his life and social position, the plan of his history, its style and technique, the use of epitomes, and the manuscript tradition. Limitations of space prevented his treating any of these topics in detail, but his command of the field, his admirable sense of perspective, and his compact style have enabled him to include in small space a surprising amount of valuable information.

The Latin text has been set up from the last edition by Weissenborn and Müller, but many changes have been introduced from the Oxford text by Conway and Walters. The text of the *Periochae* is that of Rossbach.

The translation is of distinct merit. It adheres closely to the original, but is couched in idiomatic English. If any criticism is to be made it is that in some passages, especially in the matter of periodic structure, it follows the original too closely. This is especially noticeable in the translation of the Preface, which is the least successful of the translator's efforts. Just how far this close adherence to the original represents Professor Foster's own ideal of translation or the standard fixed by the editorial board of the series the reviewer is not in a position to state.

In a few cases the translator's English is open to criticism: e.g., page xxiii (Introduction), "Caligula . . . lacked but little of casting out their works"; page 15, where we have the pleonastic "affirm for certain"; page 19, "ordered the children to be committed to the river"; page 27, "chose out those of the cattle"; page 33, "the city was . . . reaching out its walls." It is doubtful, moreover, whether the style of the translation gains anything by the use of archaisms like "avouch" (p. 1), "in menacing wise" (p. 25), and "added these words *withal*." As regards correctness and accuracy the translation takes high rank, and it is only occasionally that renderings are found which might be criticized on the ground of vagueness or inaccuracy as on page 31, "purple-bordered toga" for *toga praetexta* (it was red, not purple); and page 37, "taking her to Thalassius" for *Thalassio ferre*, where the meaning is that "she was being carried off for Thalassius." These are, however, minor points, more or less inevitable in so large a task as Professor Foster has undertaken.

G. J. LAING

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Die germanische Urgeschichte in Tacitus Germania. VON EDUARD NORDEN. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1920. x+505.

The quotation from Jakob Grimm on the title-page aptly indicates the nature and scope of this volume: "nirgends wo europäische Geschichte beginnt, hebt sie ganz von Frischem an, sondern setzt immer lange dunkle Zeiten voraus, durch welche ihr eine frühere Welt verknüpft wird." For the author's discussion of the ethnology of the *Germania* grows into a critical analysis of the history of primitive Germany, in which with striking acumen and great erudition he estimates the contributions and traces the relations of Posidonius, Procopius, Caesar, Pliny the Elder, and Jordanes. He does not however confine himself to literary sources. The latest results of archaeological research are also presented and effectively woven into the fabric of his argument.

The range of the volume may be seen from the chapter titles: I, *Die Germania im Rahmen der ethnographischen Literatur des Altertums*;

II, Quellenkritisches zur ethnographie europäischer Völker; III, Herakles und Odysseus in Germanien; IV, Auf den Spuren der *Bella Germaniae* des Plinius; V, Die Entstehungsgeschichte des Germanennamens: Wort-Interpretationen; VI, Ethnologische, onomatologische und geschichtliche Folgerungen. Berührungen von Kelten- und Germanentum. To these chapters (each of which is a substantial treatise) are added several appendixes: (1) Zur Überlieferung der *Germania*; (2) Stiltechnisches zur *Germania*; (3) Eine Polemik des Poseidonios gegen Artemidoros über die Ethnologie der Kimbern; (4) *Columnae Herculis*; (5) Die helvetische Einwanderung (by H. Philipp); (6) Die Ethnographischen Abschnitte Caesars über Suebi und Germani; (7) Zwei Stationennamen am Niederrhein; and (8) *Alamanni* Stamm- und Volksname.

One of the most interesting parts of the book is the discussion of the influence which Pliny's *Bella Germaniae* has had not only upon the *Germania* but upon other works of Tacitus. That Pliny was one of Tacitus' sources has of course always been known (the historian himself refers to him): *Ann.* i. 69 (15 A.D.) *tradit C. Plinius, Germanicorum bellorum scriptor*; *ibid.* xiii. 20 (55 A.D.) *Fabius Rusticus . . . Plinius et Cluvius*, but no one has analyzed the relations of the two authors with such thoroughness and plausibility as Norden. He has made use of the work of all his predecessors in the field (he pays special tribute to Münzer's monograph *Die Quelle des Tacitus für die Germanenkriege*), and has added substantial contributions of his own. That Pliny is Tacitus' source in all the passages which Norden discusses is something which not even he would claim as finally demonstrated, but in every case he has made a strong argument, and one finishes the reading of the chapter with the feeling that Pliny's work on the German wars is not so hopelessly lost as has always been supposed.

In the purely ethnological sections of the book Norden shows the same amazing range of erudition and ingenuity of combination that we have learned to look for in all his writings.

The limits of the subject of the volume have prevented the author from discussing with the same detail as the ethnological relations such questions as the original purpose of the *Germania*, the occasion of its publication, and its literary technique. He does, however, touch upon all these problems. In regard to the first, he thinks (p. 30) that Tacitus wrote the monograph with a view to insertion (in abbreviated form) as an ethnological excursus in his historical work; that, having this in mind, he delayed its publication, and that no one can now say whether its subsequent appearance as a separate monograph ever had his authorization. On the technique of the *Germania* we have some suggestive comments in the second Appendix (Stiltechnisches zur *Germania*). This is a phase of the subject upon which Norden is especially qualified to speak, and we can only regret the brevity with which he discusses the relation of the *Germania* to the recognized type of ethnological composition as illustrated by Hecataeus and Herodotus.

The volume is dedicated to Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf and Hermann Diels, on the fiftieth anniversary of their doctorate. It will be of great service not only to classical scholars but to all students of the primitive history of Central Europe.

G. J. LAING

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Hellenistic Influence on the Aeneid. By ELEANOR SHIPLEY DUCKETT.

Northampton, Massachusetts: Smith College Classical Studies.

No. 1, 1920. Pp. xi+68.

A new series of classical studies from one of the women's colleges is initiated by Miss Duckett's elaboration of articles already published in the *Classical Journal*. The first chapter briefly sketches the Hellenistic Age, the second and third discuss the influence of Hellenistic life and thought upon the *Aeneid*, the last chapter enlarges upon the suggestion that the technique of the *Aeneid* is affected by the technique of Hellenistic historians, and a few pages at the end are devoted to rhetorical and metrical notes.

The first three chapters present the aspects of Hellenistic society and culture which are familiar to readers of Wendland and Kaerst, the individualistic and realistic tendencies of the day, with illustrations of the reflections in the *Aeneid* of these notable features. The treatment is fairly well organized and very readable. One may question a few generalizations that are common nowadays; for example, Is not the tangible evidence of the increased freedom of women in the Hellenistic period (p. 3) limited mainly to the court circles? Is there really "need of care lest undue influence be granted to the Hellenistic spirit in describing the emotional side of Vergil's work" (p. 29)? Is it not, on the contrary, true that current appreciation of Vergil vastly overestimates the poet's personal contribution in this regard? Did not Vergil simply regulate artistically the emotion which runs riot in Hellenistic poetry?

The last chapter, on technique, follows a clue suggested by Heinze; many features of the poet's technique are novel in the development of epic narrative; historical epic, like Ennius' *Annales*, used prose documents; was Vergil, either indirectly, through authors like Ennius, or directly influenced by the technique of later historians? Here Miss Duckett seems to me to have labored somewhat unnecessarily. What need is there of enlarging upon the moral aims of the historians as an explanation of the obvious moral earnestness of the Roman poet when this function of poetry was commonly recognized as early as Euripides' famous answer to Aeschylus' query in the *Frogs*? Why need Vergil turn to historians in his effort *prodesse et delectare* if the moral and aesthetic aims of art were established in poetic theory in the fourth century? If the historians study the origin and motives of the

incidents they record, this feature of their narrative, and Vergil's corresponding interest in psychology and causal nexus, are hardly more than a common result of broadly Hellenistic introspection and analysis, as Miss Duckett herself seems to admit on page 51. And if history in the Hellenistic period easily becomes a drama, and the historians delight in dramatic scenes, who shall say whether Vergil's most characteristic quality, his organization of epic narrative into small and large dramatic units, is the result of direct or indirect study of later historians, or whether both the historians and Vergil are under the spell of the older Greek drama, to which certainly the poet is sometimes directly indebted?

In brief, the unity of Miss Duckett's essay and the force of her presentation would have been improved, I think, if the last chapter had been handled in the same way as the earlier chapters, noting the broad indebtedness to Hellenistic spirit and ideas in technique as in other material, and leaving to footnotes the suggestive points of contact with Hellenistic historiography. And this lack of unity is somewhat unpleasantly increased by concluding the essay with scattering notes on rhetorical and metrical details.

HENRY W. PRESCOTT

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

L'Arte Classica. By PERICLE DUCATI. Turin: Unione Tipografico-Editrice Torinese, 1920. Pp. xxiii+965, Figs. 860. 66 Italian lire.

To write a history of classic art in one volume is certainly a *tour de force*—to dwell duly upon certain monuments which are important but unattractive, not to overemphasize one's own special favorites, to bring together knowledge from so many different sources and to co-relate the whole, that is a work requiring the utmost skill and learning. Yet it is a task which the author has accomplished, and he has added a charm of style and generous supply of illustrations which lead the reader on from chapter to chapter of this bulky handbook. It is a work written primarily for Italians, and special stress is therefore laid upon finds and objects of art in Italy.

The author remarks that the marble and fictile figurines from Crete and those from the Cyclades are important as being among the earliest attempts to portray a divinity—a somewhat hazardous conclusion, especially as one of the figurines illustrated is playing the lyre which, taken in conjunction with the frequently found flute players, points rather to "worshipers," or even to a *genre* subject.

The account of the Minoan palaces and architecture is concisely expressed, although it is classified under the rather misleading title of

"Creto-Mykenean." The wonderful fayence figurines are figured and described, but nothing is said of the remarkable little ivory and gold lady now in the Boston Museum of Fine Arts (*American Journal of Archaeology*, XIX [1915], 237-49, Pls. X-XVI). A more serious oversight is the lack of reference to the finds in South Russia, where some of the burials have been dated in the third millennium B.C., while others resemble the objects found in the second city of Troy, but are somewhat earlier.

Curiously enough, in the description of the early temples in Sicily there is no word of the Athenaion at Syracuse, a temple which Professor Orsi's recent excavations have shown to be of superlative value for the history of early architecture. In connection with the seated statues of the seventh to fifth centuries B.C. attention should be drawn to the series of figures from Sicily, in local stone or in terra cotta; their great merit consists in the fact that they prove the existence of a flourishing school of local sculptors, to a certain extent substantiating the claims made on their behalf as pupils of Daedalos by ancient writers; moreover in these figures one can trace a rapid artistic and technical evolution, since they ranged from the uncouth, almost amorphous seated female from Grammichele to the exquisite enthroned goddess now in the Berlin Museum.

The early ceramics are clearly differentiated and mention is made of the most important vases. The author wisely refrains from entering into the subtleties of Helladic ware and similar subdivisions; even Boeotian and Cabirian ware are not considered worthy of notice, although some good examples of the latter were found in Sicily.

A page only is devoted to Cypriote art, which might be thought deserving of fuller treatment in consideration of the number and vividness of the portrait statues.

Although there is a brief reference to Exekias, Amasis is entirely ignored and we are given instead an ugly illustration (Fig. 238) of a Panathenaic amphora.

The Ludovisi "throne" is discussed at some length, but nothing is said about its counterpart in Boston. Neither is there any description of that work of the twilight of Greek art, the Demeter of Lycosura of Damophon, not a great artist, perhaps, but deserving of notice as typical of the artistic tendencies of his day. The study of portraiture, too, does not receive its due place; scanty reference is made to the splendid Greek portrait heads, and one is even more sensible of the deficiency when dealing with late Roman works, for at that period it was mainly by the imperial portraits that the artistic torch was still carried on.

But the two branches of art which are most inadequately treated are coins and gems, both valuable sources for our knowledge of ancient art, and both here dismissed with an occasional casual mention to illustrate something else.

There is in Appendix I a chronological history of archaeological finds: one admires the industry and erudition of the author, but one cannot help wishing some of that energy shown in the collection of such material had gone toward amplifying the exceedingly meager bibliography which only enumerates for the help of the student the most obvious works of reference. Our regret is deepened, because we are sure that the author, in order to write a book which is so packed with valuable information gathered from such various sources, must have had an unusually rich bibliography at his fingers' ends.

E. DOUGLAS VAN BUREN

ROME

Achilles Tatius. With an English translation by S. GASELEE.

London: William Heinemann; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. Loeb Classical Library, 1917. Pp. xvi+461.

The perpetually renewed vicissitudes and surprises of the somewhat trivially melodramatic amours of Leucippe and Clitophon, the disquisitions on the psychology of love, the rhetorical virtuosity of the descriptions of the pictures of Europa, the rhinoceros, the crocodile, the phoenix and the syrinx, the oratory of the murder trial—all this Mr. Gaselee renders into excellent and readable English. His allusions to "photographs" and "churches" will startle some readers, and his persistent designation of the priest of Artemis as the "bishop" recalls the medieval naïveté of Chaucer's.

How that the bishop as the book can telle
Amphiorax fell through the ground to helle.

Perhaps he is following the Elizabethan translation by W. B(urton) (London, 1597), of which he owns the only existing copy. He frankly admits that a critical edition of the text has yet to be made. His preface discusses the contributions thereto of the three-column fragment published in volume ten of Grenfell and Hunt's *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* which antedates all extant manuscripts by a thousand years. In a few doubtful passages he offers hesitatingly suggestions of his own or of a friend. But his usual method of dealing with a corrupt or difficult passage, such as the description of the syrinx, is to say that the Greek is very hard and that he has tried to give the general sense. Apart from such passages the translation is substantially correct and there are very few slips. In ii. 4 *ὁκνεῖν δὲ ἐλέγχειν βουλόμενον λαθεῖν* is not "I . . . have preferred to seem ignorant." *βουλόμενον* is the object of *ἐλέγχειν*. In v. 16. 7 I fear the translator's innocence has been imposed upon. *φιλοσοφῶμεν ὃ γίναι μέχρις λαβόμεθα γῆς* is surely not "Let us continue these arguments, dear lady, until we touch land," but "soyons sage." Greek is almost as tricky as French. In viii. 6. 5 in

the description of the syrinx τὸ δὲ ἕσω μέσον ἐστὶ τῷ περιττῷ is rendered "And the middle one is half way in size between the first and the last." May it not rather be an ingenious way of saying that the innermost is (exactly) the middle by reason of the entire number being odd? Interesting is the coincidence pointed out (viii. 3. 1) between πάλεως οὐκ ἀσήμεον and St. Paul's οὐκ ἀσήμεον πάλεως (Acts 21:39).

The paleographical evidence of the papyrus fragment, Mr. Gaselee thinks, forbids us to date the composition of Clitophon and Leucippe after 300 A.D. If the author was a Christian it must have been late and little. It is more probable that he was a lawyer.

PAUL SHOREY

De Richardo Bentleio atque de ratione eius critica. By THEODORUS LE ROUX. Amsterdam: Swets & Zeitlinger, 1916. Pp. 60.

Few doctoral dissertations are epoch-making works, and that by Le Roux is no exception. In the main chapter he attempts to show by a classification of some of the readings defended by Bentley in his *Horace* what Bentley's critical method was. He depends chiefly on Keller and on the *Horazstudien* of Beck. The material is selected, not complete.

Chapter i gives a sketchy account of the great men of Europe living between 1600 and 1800. Mention is made of Milton and Bacon, but not of Shakespeare (perhaps the author believes Bacon wrote "Shakespeare"), of Defoe, Swift, Johnson, but not of Dryden or Pope, etc. The statement is made that at the time of Bentley's birth (1662) more than two centuries had elapsed since the rediscovery of the writings of antiquity. It was, in point of fact, more than three centuries. Le Roux holds that Bentley was concerned with the subject-matter rather than the form of the works which he handled. He quotes from Bentley himself to prove this, but a fuller quotation given in another connection shows that Bentley says that he is concerned only with the correctness of the text, not with the subject-matter.

Chapter ii deals with the influences affecting Bentley's nature, and chapter iii with the edition of Horace and the later works. It is brought out that his confidence in the correctness of his own judgment was due to the acclaim with which his earlier work, especially his edition of Callimachus and his dissertation on the letters of Phalaris, was received and to the continual controversies in which he was engaged as Master of Trinity College, Cambridge. As a result, reckless emendation became a habit with him. Another factor, not mentioned by Le Roux, is implicit in Bentley's own words in the Introduction to his *Horace*. In his day manuscripts were counted, not rated: quantity was the determining factor, not quality.

If fifteen manuscripts had one reading and fourteen had another, the former group might well be preferred. Bentley tired of this unscientific method and resorted to emendation. He says that one might as well emend as try to defend the reading of one manuscript against many. Though ahead of his age, he was not great enough to develop the scientific method of the nineteenth century. There is then no need to wonder, as does Le Roux, why Bentley made no great effort to become acquainted with foreign manuscripts. His principle, *Ratio et res ipsa centum codicibus potiores sunt*, is utterly at variance with the best practice of today. There are, however, those who still count that day lost on which they do not emend at least one passage in the Benteleian manner. It is not too much to say that Bentley's influence, direct or indirect, is partly responsible for this situation. We laugh at his emendations of *Paradise Lost* (Le Roux quotes VI, 513, "They found they mingled, and, with subtle art," emended by Bentley to "They pound, they mingle, and with sooty chark"), we reject many of his emendations of Greek and Roman authors, but some of us still use his methods. In his very greatness Bentley shows his weakness: strikingly successful in some of his emendations, he emends everything in sight; discovering the digamma in Homer, he sees digammas in every word of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. The revelation of this weakness, so characteristic of scholars of all ages, should be enough to dispel the awe in which Bentley is still held.

The first three chapters cover less than nineteen pages and the rest of the book is taken up by chapter iv, on the errors which Bentley made and which were the cause of his many emendations. First it is shown by selected examples that he preferred readings of the manuscripts of Keller's third (and worst) class. Then the emendations are considered. Le Roux groups under Bentley's emendations many which were found by Bentley in earlier editions or in manuscripts. It is true that these readings came into prominence through Bentley's authority, but the failure to distinguish them from Bentley's own makes it impossible to appreciate the extent and nature of his work.

As an example of Bentley's "rationalizing" tendency Le Roux cites, among other examples, the famous *vepris . . . ad ventum* of *Carm.* i. 23. 5. This is still to be seen in some of our Horace texts, though it spoils the poetry of Horace's line. Bentley's lack of a poetic sense and of an appreciation of Horace's nature are illustrated by *Marsi* in *Carm.* i. 2. 39: *acer et Mauri peditis cruentum voltus in hostem*. Le Roux takes his defense of the manuscript reading *Mauri* from Beck. But another defense may be found in the word order, which has heretofore been ignored, so far as is known. Granting that the *Mauri* were usually horsemen, one may defend the meaning "unhorsed" for *peditis* by pointing out that *peditis* and *cruentum* are then the crucial words. This would seem to be indicated by their juxtaposition. The fight has been a desperate one; the Moor has wounded his enemy, but has been forced from his horse. They now glare at each other for a fleeting

moment before engaging in the death struggle—a statuesque situation worthy of a Myron.

Another group of examples illustrates Bentley's misuse or suppression of parallel passages. *Marsi* appears again in this group on account of the omission of certain parallel passages. Another group of examples shows how Bentley emended from the mere love of emending even where he admitted the correctness of the traditional reading. Another group illustrates miscellaneous errors, as of quantity in *Gyges* (*Carm.* ii. 17. 14). A final group, not clearly differentiated from the others, does injustice even to Bentley. For example, he is charged with wilful emendation in *Carm.* i. 23. 1 *vitas* (MSS, *vitat*). But *vitas* is found in a few manuscripts and in earlier editions; it is the generally accepted reading today—and Bentley does not even comment on it! Why pick on Bentley? He has enough to answer for.

In a final section two examples are given to show that Bentley can emend felicitously. As a matter of fact, one is not and the other may not be original with Bentley. Neither is universally accepted. The first is *Carm.* iii. 5. 15, *trahenti*, where Le Roux says: "Auctor noster coniecturam Canteri *trahenti* legit . . . Bentleyus hoc loco feliciter emendat." When is an emendation not an emendation? Apparently it does not become one until Bentley accepts it. The other passage is *Serm.* ii. 4. 19, *mixto* for *mixto*. This reading is found in one or more manuscripts (Keller and Holder's y, which includes manuscripts known to Bentley) and may not be original with him, though he put it forth as his own.

The dissertation is decidedly inferior to the other Amsterdam dissertation on Horace reviewed by the present reviewer in *Classical Philology*, VII, 510.

B. L. ULLMAN

UNIVERSITY OF IOWA

Modern Greek Stories. Translated by DEMETRA VAKA and ARISTIDES PHOUTRIDES. New York: Duffield and Company. Pp. 270. \$1.90 net.

In the volume before us we have ten tales adequately translated by Demetra Vaka and Aristides Phoutrides. As one reads the book it is very easy to forget that there is a political Greece with its seething problems, or a sophisticated up-to-date capital city like Athens; for the atmosphere throughout is that of sea and shore and tiny hamlet. In choosing selections that breathe only this atmosphere the editors have incurred a little danger of giving a slightly one-sided impression to readers unfamiliar with the more advanced side of contemporary Greece, but this would be a *κίνδυνος κίνδυνος* in the case of readers of *Classical Philology*. With this unimportant limitation, one may say that the tales are well chosen and thoroughly

readable. Not one of them is without merit and interest, and two or three deserve very strong praise, while the longest of them, "A Man's Death," by the poet Kostas Palamas, is quite unforgettable in its vivid and powerful presentation. Moreover, classically trained readers will find not only good stories and clear pictures of modern Greece, but also a delightful challenge to note "echoes and survivals" from olden days. One reader, at any rate, has already found himself taking down his copy of Mr. J. C. Lawson's *Modern Greek Folklore and Ancient Greek Religion* and comparing notes with genuine pleasure.

Our volume is the second representative of "The Interpreter's Series," and ought to win friends for this laudable plan of making accessible some of the less familiar literature of the world. The general scheme calls for a preface to each volume and Demetra Vaka has used the Foreword to pay a glowing tribute to the inspiring services rendered by poets and other writers in the struggles of modern Greece for independence.

After a rather long experience in reviewing I find myself very modest about my judgment of the pleasure and profit likely to accrue to others from a book of tales, but I should assuredly be grateful to any friend who recommended to me strongly and cordially such a collection as *Modern Greek Stories*.

F. B. R. HELLEMS

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO

Studies in Magic from Latin Literature. By EUGENE TAVENNER.

New York: Columbia University Press.

Some of the author's conclusions are that the Roman conception of magic was essentially the same as ours; that, so far as we can judge from our knowledge of Roman law, religion, science, and literature, belief in magic existed among the Romans from the earliest period and was not imported from Greece or the Orient; and that the attempt of educated Romans to appear superior in such matters does not convince one that they had really shaken off their inherited belief in magical agencies.

While none of these conclusions is new, in no other work known to the reviewer has the evidence been so carefully collected and so wisely judged. The author cites practically all the important passages bearing on each phase of the subject and makes a thorough analysis of them.

The work is divided into two parts: I, "Introduction to the Study of Roman Magic" (pp. 1-60), and II, "Magic and Prevention of Disease" (pp. 61-123). The latter is a detailed study of prophylactic magic, and a very considerable amount of space is given to a discussion of amulets.

The book is a doctoral dissertation of Columbia University, and shows a combination of sound scholarship and interesting presentation not always found in publications of this class.

G. J. LAING

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Fasti Triumphales Populi Romani. By ETTORE PAIS. Rome: Nardecchia, 1920. Pp. clxviii+546.

Those who had the privilege of visiting Rome during the war discovered, if never before, that ancient Rome is still a potent force in politics. During the many periods of gloom the government frequently found occasion for calling attention to the evidences of former greatness. Rome's "2770th birthday" was, for instance, celebrated by thousands of school children who marched through the Forum to offer their gold to the treasury "as their forefathers had done in the Punic war." On the Capitoline the premier addressed the assembled people on the occasion of America's declaration of war. Again and again when distressing news came, the orators standing in the presence of ancient monuments offered the consolation of past example. To the American observer it appeared as if the spirit of old Rome was ever present to inspire and admonish.

All this is vividly called to mind by the preface in which Professor Pais explains that he has undertaken an Italian edition of the triumphal lists as a kind of patriotic duty. Lest the American reader infer from this statement that the book is a hasty compilation, we must add at once that it is entirely worthy of the great historian's reputation. At every point attacked it provides an advance upon the editions of Schön and of the Corpus.

The long introduction gives a very convenient outline of the customs of war and peace connected with Roman triumphs. The edition of the fasti that follows is conservative and reliable; the three hundred pages of notes present much material which is not to be found in previous editions. The most valuable portion is perhaps the volume of appendixes. The excellent photographic reproductions of the fragments on fourteen plates will please students of epigraphy and paleography alike, and the new conclusions regarding the probable contents of the lacunae are particularly helpful because they are based upon new measurements provided by an engineer of the municipality and upon the vast knowledge of sources always at the author's command. It is a pleasure to note in the preface that Professor Pais also intends to issue an edition of the Consular Fasti.

TENNEY FRANK

FRANK BIGELOW TARBELL

1853-1920

The death of Frank Bigelow Tarbell, on December 4, 1920, has taken from us an outstanding personality among the veteran classical scholars of America, and one of the first in this country definitely to devote himself to the field of classical archaeology.

Mr. Tarbell was born in Groton, Massachusetts, in 1853, and graduated from Yale College in 1873 at the head of his class. He taught Greek at Yale 1876-87, was annual director of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens 1888-89, instructor in Greek at Harvard 1889-92, secretary of the School at Athens 1892-93, and then became permanently settled in the University of Chicago, until his retirement from the chair of Classical Archaeology in 1918. His period of freedom from academic duties proved all too short.

The writer has enjoyed the rare privilege of knowing Mr. Tarbell, not only as a colleague for more than twenty-five years, but still earlier as teacher and adviser. My admiration of his scholarship and of his character runs back to the time when every undergraduate of Yale College came under his instruction in Greek, in those last days of the old classical curriculum. Many a student came to realize for the first time in his classes in Aristophanes or in the Private Orations of Demosthenes, that Athens was a real place and the Athenians real people. The affectionate regard which is so often expressed by Yale students of that period may well be the envy of any teacher.

In Chicago, Mr. Tarbell's career changed from that of a college teacher with large undergraduate classes to that of the specialist dealing with relatively small numbers. If he sometimes missed the larger contact, as I think he did, he fully realized the better opportunity for the training of scholars and for his own research. He had the satisfaction of seeing former pupils take their place as productive scholars. He was not himself a voluminous writer, but all his published work, from his edition of the *Philippics* of Demosthenes, in his twenties, to his most recent technical articles, bear the stamp of his severely accurate scholarship and trenchant criticism. As a scholar and in his personal relations he was a man of the utmost sincerity, of sometimes appalling frankness, the uncompromising foe of unsound learning and of unsound character. Always reserved, he was withal a man of the deepest feeling and kindest nature, as those know well who knew him best.

C. D. B.



